

REPLY TO CANRIGHT

BRANSON

NEW YORK: THE PUBLISHERS OF THE BRANSON BOOKS, 1900.



286.7 B82r

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.



JUL 30 '45
SEP 22 '45

MAY JUN 6 1984

JAN 19 '78

JUN 13 1991

APR 1 '48

MAY 1 '48

FEB 28 '48

APR 19 '48

SEP 10 '48

JAN 18 '50

MAY 9 '50

OCT 71

MAY MAR 17 1976

MAY JUN 25 1979

MAY DEC 16 1983

REPLY TO CANRIGHT KANSAS CITY

The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists

—

By

WILLIAM H. BRANSON

Author of

MISSIONARY ADVENTURES IN AFRICA

THE WAY TO CHRIST

THE HOLY SPIRIT



REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

SOUTH BEND, IND.

Printed in the U. S. A.

Copyright, 1933, by the
Review and Herald Publishing Association

2197-16

PUBLIC LIBRARY
NEW YORK

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD - - - - -	7
I. WHAT DID MR. CANRIGHT RENOUNCE? -	9
II. THE LAW OF GOD - - - - -	28
III. OBJECTIONS RAISED TO THE MORAL LAW -	38
IV. THE TWO LAWS - - - - -	56
V. WHEN AND TO WHOM WAS THE SABBATH GIVEN? - - - - -	65
VI. HAS THE SABBATH BEEN LOST? - - -	73
VII. THE NATURE OF THE SABBATH COMMANDMENT	88
VIII. THE SABBATH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT -	97
IX. WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH? - - -	121
X. THE SABBATH ON A ROUND WORLD - -	156
XI. DOING OR BELIEVING - - - - -	166
XII. THE TWO COVENANTS - - - - -	178
XIII. THE NATURE OF MAN - - - - -	188
XIV. THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT - - - - -	212
XV. WHO ARE THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS? -	244
XVI. THE WORK OF MRS. E. G. WHITE - - -	261
XVII. MR. CANRIGHT'S REMARKABLE ADMISSION -	294
XVIII. LET IN THE LIGHT - - - - -	310

APR 21 1945₃

DEDICATED

TO ALL WHO BELIEVE
IN THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES
OF PROTESTANTISM,
IN THE BIBLE AS THE RULE
OF FAITH AND PRACTICE,
AND IN THE LAW OF GOD,
THE TEN COMMANDMENTS,
AS THE FOUNDATION
OF THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT.

FOREWORD

IN the year 1889 D. M. Canright, who had some months before resigned the pastorate of the Baptist church at Otsego, Michigan, U. S. A., and who at one time had been a Seventh-day Adventist preacher, published a book entitled, "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced." Since that time a number of editions of the book have been issued, and these, together with two other volumes and numerous tracts by the same author, dealing with the same subject, have been quite widely circulated. Opponents attempting to refute the teachings of Seventh-day Adventists are still making use of these publications; hence this volume.

The introduction to "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced" was written by Rev. Theo. Nelson, pastor of the First Baptist church, Saginaw, Michigan. The *Michigan Christian Advocate* (Methodist) pronounced it a "dumfounder to the Adventists," and clergymen of various evangelical churches have given it their hearty indorsement and have aided in its circulation.

Mr. Canright died May 12, 1919. During his lifetime a number of brief replies to his lectures and works were published by representatives of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, none of which are now in print. It was not expected that any further notice would need to be taken of the matter. However, it appears that since Mr. Canright's death certain religious organizations have become especially active in the circulation of his writings, thus causing confusion in some minds as to the character and work of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In view of this activity in spreading misleading statements in various parts of the world, we have felt it proper to prepare this additional "reply" to Mr. Canright's views, publishing our defense in book form so that it may be available to all who desire it.

While the work, "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," constitutes an attack on the doctrines taught by Seventh-day Adventists, it is at the same time a challenge to the whole Protestant world; for in this work Mr. Canright renounces not only Seventh-day Adventism, but also the fundamental teachings of the great Protestant churches concerning the law of God. It seems more than passing strange that certain religious leaders should give their indorsement—as many have done, and as some are still doing—to a book which not only attacks Seventh-day Adventism, but also presents arguments which, if they were sound, would overthrow some of the historic foundation principles of their own church creeds.

Says the greatest evangelist of all modern times: "The law that was given at Sinai has lost none of its solemnity. Time cannot wear out its authority or the fact of its authorship. . . . I have never met an honest man that found fault with the ten commandments."—"*Weighed and Wanting*," by D. L. Moody, p. 11.

In defense of fundamental Bible truths, and especially of the moral law, spoken by the Creator in awful majesty from Mt. Sinai, and honored, magnified, and obeyed by our Lord Jesus Christ, this present volume is sent forth to honest-hearted readers everywhere.

CHAPTER I

WHAT DID MR. CANRIGHT RENOUNCE?

MR. CANRIGHT says that he renounced *Seventh-day Adventism*. He had served as a minister of the Seventh-day Adventist Church for some twenty-eight years (with two or three short interruptions) before he permanently withdrew from the Adventists, and united with the Baptist Church. He informs us, however, that even during these years of ministry, while he was ardently proclaiming the doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists, he had many qualms regarding the truthfulness of his own teachings, and that this so preyed upon his mind that on two or three occasions he dropped his ministry and took up other work. After he finally gave up Adventism entirely, and severed his connection with the Seventh-day Adventist Church, he offered the following reason for having ever been deceived by what he later came to look upon as a system of error :

"I united with the Adventists when I was a mere boy, uneducated, with no knowledge of the Bible, or history, or of other churches. I went into it through ignorance. For years my zeal for that faith, and my unbounded confidence in its leaders, blinded me to their errors."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 52.

Then we are told of his growing doubts and final renunciation :

"My doubts of the system did not come to me all at once and clearly. It was well known that for the last dozen years I was with them, I was greatly troubled over these things. Gradually, year by year, the evidence accumulated, till at last it overbalanced the doctrine, and then reluctantly and sorrowfully I had to abandon and renounce it."—*Id.*, p. 53.

It is only proper that we should now pause to ask, What is this "system" into which Mr. Canright went "through igno-

rance," and concerning which he later began to have doubts? What is the faith which his doubts overbalanced and which he finally felt compelled to "abandon and renounce"? Did Mr. Canright really renounce a system of error built upon the superstitions of an ignorant people; or did he, perchance, renounce the truth and go away into darkness?

These questions are vital, and should be understood by the reader before we proceed to reply to some of the many arguments Mr. Canright employs against the doctrines themselves.

WHAT IS SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM?

Mr. Canright says he renounced "Seventh-day Adventism." His book indicates that he rejected it *in toto*. He brands it as a system of error, and a "yoke of bondage" ("Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 59), and declares that "it leads to infidelity" (*Id.*, p. 64). If, therefore, we can ascertain what Seventh-day Adventists really believe, we shall understand clearly what it was that Mr. Canright renounced. We will therefore briefly state their cardinal doctrines as recorded in their denominational Year Book, edition of 1933, pp. 5-8.

"FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

"Seventh-day Adventists hold certain fundamental beliefs, the principal features of which, together with a portion of the Scriptural references upon which they are based, may be summarized as follows:

"1. That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, contain an all-sufficient revelation of His will to men, and are the only unerring rule of faith and practice. 2 Tim. 3:15-17.

"2. That the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, a personal, spiritual Being, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, infinite in wisdom and love; the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, through whom all things were created and through whom the salvation of the redeemed hosts will be accomplished; the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, the great regenerating power in the work of redemption. Matt. 28:19.

"3. That Jesus Christ is very God, being of the same nature and essence as the Eternal Father. While retaining His divine nature He took upon Himself the nature of the human family,

lived on the earth as a man, exemplified in His life as our Example the principles of righteousness, attested His relationship to God by many mighty miracles, died for our sins on the cross, was raised from the dead, and ascended to the Father, where He ever lives to make intercession for us. John 1:1, 14; Heb. 2:9-18; 8:1, 2; 4:14-16; 7:25.

"4. That every person in order to obtain salvation must experience the new birth; that this comprises an entire transformation of life and character by the re-creative power of God through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. John 3:16; Matt. 18:3; Acts 2:37-39.

"5. That baptism is an ordinance of the Christian church, and should follow repentance and forgiveness of sins. By its observance faith is shown in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. That the proper form of baptism is by immersion. Rom. 6:1-6; Acts 16:30-33.

"6. That the will of God as it relates to moral conduct is comprehended in His law of ten commandments; that these are great moral, unchangeable precepts, binding upon all men in every age. Ex. 20:1-17.

"7. That the fourth commandment of this unchangeable law requires the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. This holy institution is at the same time a memorial of creation and a sign of sanctification, a sign of the believer's rest from his own works of sin, and his entrance into the rest of soul which Jesus promises to those who come to Him. Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8-11; 31:12-17; Heb. 4:1-10.

"8. That the law of ten commandments points out sin, the penalty of which is death. The law cannot save the transgressor from his sin, nor impart power to keep him from sinning. In infinite love and mercy, God provides a way whereby this may be done. He furnishes a substitute, even Christ the Righteous One, to die in man's stead, making 'Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' 2 Cor. 5:21. That one is justified, not by obedience to the law, but by the grace that is in Christ Jesus. By accepting Christ, man is reconciled to God, justified by His blood for the sins of the past, and saved from the power of sin by His indwelling life. Thus the gospel becomes 'the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' This experience is wrought by the divine agency of the Holy Spirit, who convicts of sin and leads to the Sin-bearer, inducting the believer into the new covenant relationship, where the law of God is written on his heart, and through the enabling power of the indwelling Christ, his life is brought into conformity to the divine precepts. The honor and merit of this wonderful transformation belong wholly to Christ. 1 John 3:4; Rom. 7:7; 3:20; Eph. 2:8-10; 1 John 2:1, 2; Rom. 5:8-10; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 3:17; Heb. 8:8-12.

"9. That God only hath immortality. Mortal man possesses a nature inherently sinful and dying. Immortality and eternal life come only through the gospel, and are bestowed as the free gift of God at the second advent of Jesus Christ our Lord. 1 Tim. 6:15, 16; 1 Cor. 15:51-55.

"10. That the condition of man in death is one of unconsciousness. That all men, good and evil alike, remain in the grave from death to the resurrection. Eccl. 9:5, 6; Ps. 146:3, 4; John 5:28, 29.

"11. That there shall be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust. The resurrection of the just will take place at the second coming of Christ; the resurrection of the unjust will take place a thousand years later, at the close of the millennium. John 5:28, 29; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; Rev. 20:5-10.

"12. That the finally impenitent, including Satan, the author of sin, will, by the fires of the last day, be reduced to a state of nonexistence, becoming as though they had not been, thus purging God's universe of sin and sinners. Rom. 6:23; Mal. 4:1-3; Rev. 20:9, 10; Obadiah 16.

"13. That no prophetic period is given in the Bible to reach to the second advent, but that the longest one, the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, terminated in 1844, and brought us to an event called the cleansing of the sanctuary.

"14. That the true sanctuary, of which the tabernacle on earth was a type, is the temple of God in heaven, of which Paul speaks in Hebrews 8 and onward, and of which the Lord Jesus, as our great high priest, is minister; and that the priestly work of our Lord is the antitype of the work of the Jewish priests of the former dispensation; that this heavenly sanctuary is the one to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14; its cleansing being, as in the type, a work of judgment, beginning with the entrance of Christ as the high priest upon the judgment phase of His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary foreshadowed in the earthly service of cleansing the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement. This work of judgment in the heavenly sanctuary began in 1844. Its completion will close human probation.

"15. That God, in the time of the judgment and in accordance with His uniform dealing with the human family in warning them of coming events vitally affecting their destiny (Amos 3:6, 7), sends forth a proclamation of the approach of the second advent of Christ; that this work is symbolized by the three angels of Revelation 14; and that their threefold message brings to view a work of reform to prepare a people to meet Him at His coming.

"16. That the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, synchronizing with the period of the proclamation of the message of Revelation 14, is a time of investigative judgment, first with reference to the dead, and secondly, with reference to the living. This investigative judgment determines who of the myriads sleeping in

the dust of the earth are worthy of a part in the first resurrection, and who of its living multitudes are worthy of translation. 1 Peter 4:17, 18; Dan. 7:9, 10; Rev. 14: 6, 7; Luke 20:35.

"17. That the followers of Christ should be a godly people, not adopting the unholy maxims nor conforming to the unrighteous ways of the world, not loving its sinful pleasures nor countenancing its follies. That the believer should recognize his body as the temple of the Holy Spirit, and that therefore he should clothe that body in neat, modest, dignified apparel. Further, that in eating and drinking and in his entire course of conduct he should shape his life as becometh a follower of the meek and lowly Master. Thus the believer will be led to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, tobacco, and other narcotics, and the avoidance of every body-and-soul-defiling habit and practice. 1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 9:25; 10:31; 1 Tim. 2:9, 10; 1 John 2:6.

"18. That the divine principle of tithes and offerings for the support of the gospel is an acknowledgment of God's ownership in our lives, and that we are stewards who must render account to Him of all that He has committed to our possession. Lev. 27:30; Mal. 3:8-12; Matt. 23:23; 1 Cor. 9:9-14; 2 Cor. 9:6-15.

"19. That God has placed in His church the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as enumerated in 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4. That these gifts operate in harmony with the divine principles of the Bible, and are given for the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ. Rev. 12:17; 19:10; 1 Cor. 1:5-7.

"20. That the second coming of Christ is the great hope of the church, the grand climax of the gospel and plan of salvation. His coming will be literal, personal, and visible. Many important events will be associated with His return, such as the resurrection of the dead, the destruction of the wicked, the purification of the earth, the reward of the righteous, the establishment of His everlasting kingdom. The almost complete fulfillment of various lines of prophecy, particularly those found in the books of Daniel and the Revelation, with existing conditions in the physical, social, industrial, political, and religious worlds, indicates that Christ's coming 'is near, even at the doors.' The exact time of that event has not been foretold. Believers are exhorted to be ready, for 'in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man' will be revealed. Luke 21:25-27; 17:26-30; John 14:1-3; Acts 1:9-11; Rev. 1:7; Heb. 9:28; James 5:1-8; Joel 3:9-16; 2 Tim. 3:1-5; Dan. 7:27; Matt. 24:36, 44.

"21. That the millennial reign of Christ covers the period between the first and the second resurrection, during which time the saints of all ages will live with their blessed Redeemer in heaven. At the end of the millennium, the Holy City with all the saints will descend to the earth. The wicked, raised in the second resurrec-

tion, will go up on the breadth of the earth with Satan at their head to compass the camp of the saints, when fire will come down from God out of heaven and devour them. In the conflagration which destroys Satan and his host, the earth itself will be regenerated and cleansed from the effects of the curse. Thus the universe of God will be purified from the foul blot of sin. Revelation 20; Zech. 14:1-4; 2 Peter 3:7-10.

"22. That God will make all things new. The earth, restored to its pristine beauty, will become forever the abode of the saints of the Lord. The promise to Abraham, that through Christ he and his seed should possess the earth throughout the endless ages of eternity, will be fulfilled. The kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven will be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him. Christ, the Lord, will reign supreme, and every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, will ascribe blessing and honor and glory and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Gen. 13:14-17; Rom. 4:13; Heb. 11:8-16; Matt. 5:5; Isaiah 35; Rev. 21:1-7; Dan. 7:27; Rev. 5:13."

This is, in brief, what Seventh-day Adventists believe, and this is, therefore, what Mr. Canright renounced and endeavored to refute.

The one point on which Mr. Canright centers his most powerful attacks, and which appears to have been his chief stumblingblock, is the one mentioned under Nos. 6-8, that of the immutability and unchanging nature of the law of God as contained in the ten commandments. In his renunciation of Seventh-day Adventism he claims to have discovered that "the law was given only to the Jews" ("Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 320), that it was nailed to the cross, and that it is, therefore, not binding upon Christians.

We would, however, call the attention of the reader to the fact that in declaring that Christians are no longer under obligation to observe the ten commandments, it was not only Seventh-day Adventism that Mr. Canright renounced, but practically all Protestantism. Seventh-day Adventists do not stand alone in teaching that Christians are under obligation to obey God and keep His law as contained in the ten commandments.

In fact, all the great denominations have for centuries believed in the binding claims of the moral law. This doctrine is clearly and emphatically set forth in the "Baptist Church Manual," the church to which Mr. Canright fled when he escaped the so-called delusions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

This Baptist document declares:

"We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government."—*"Baptist Church Manual," art. 12.*

Now here is a strange spectacle: A Seventh-day Adventist clergyman revolts against the teaching of that church that the ten commandment law is still binding upon Christians, holds up Seventh-day Adventists to ridicule because of their ignorance, revealed in their supposition that the moral law continued to exist after the cross, and flees to the Baptist Church for refuge from this "yoke of bondage." Yet when we follow him to his new church home, where he professed to enjoy wonderful liberty and freedom from the law, we ascertain upon inquiry that the official pronouncement of that church and of its founders on this point is in perfect accord with the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists, and uncompromisingly opposed to Mr. Canright's so-called new-found liberty.

And to this agree the leaders of the great Protestant churches, as is seen by the following statements made by them in official documents:

PROTESTANTS AND THE LAW

John Calvin, regarded as the father of Presbyterianism and also indirectly of the Calvinistic Baptists, said:

"We must not imagine that the coming of Christ has freed us from the authority of the law; for it is the eternal rule of a devout and holy life, and must therefore be as unchangeable as the justice of God, which it embraced, is constant and uniform."—*Calvin's Comment on Matt. 5:17 and Luke 16:17, in "Commentary on a Harmony of the Gospels," Vol. I, p. 277.*

In the "Methodist Church Discipline," edition of 1904, page 23, we read: "No Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

Investigation will reveal the fact that the Wesleyan Discipline, and also that of the Church of England, read the same as the above.

The Rev. Dwight L. Moody, whom Mr. Canright quotes as authority on a number of points, published a book some years before his death, in which is to be found the following clear-cut statement:

"The commandments of God given to Moses in the mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people."—*"Weighed and Wanted,"* p. 15. Fleming H. Revell Co., 1898.

How tragic it is to see ministers like Mr. Canright turn away from this generally accepted doctrine, and help to break down God's moral barriers against sin and crime.

Again let us listen to Mr. Moody:

"Infidels may mock the Lawgiver and reject Him who has delivered us from the curse of the law, but they can't help admitting that the commandments are right. Renan said that they are for all nations, and will remain the commandments of God during all the centuries.

"If God created this world, He must make some laws to govern it. In order to make life safe, we must have good laws; there is not a country the sun shines upon that does not possess laws. Now this is God's law. It has come from on high, and infidels and skeptics have to admit that it is pure."—*Id.*, p. 11.

In full accord with these declarations of faith are the words of the Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon, the well-known Baptist preacher, who, in a sermon preached in London, England, in 1898, and widely published, appearing first in Australia, in the *Melbourne Age*, said:

"The law of God must be perpetual. There is no abrogation of it, nor amendment of it. It is not to be toned down or adjusted to our fallen condition; but every one of the Lord's righteous judgments abideth forever. . . . To show that He never meant to abrogate the law, our Lord Jesus has embodied all its commands in His own life."

Dr. Adam Clarke (Methodist commentator) writes:

“Thus it appears that man cannot have a true notion of sin but by means of the law of God. . . . And let it be observed, that the law did not answer this end merely among the Jews in the days of the apostle; it is just as necessary to the Gentiles to the present hour. Nor do we find that true repentance takes place where the moral law is not preached and enforced. Those who preach only the gospel to sinners, at best only heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly. The law, therefore, is the grand instrument in the hands of a faithful minister, to alarm and awaken sinners; and he may safely show that every sinner is under the law, and consequently under the curse, who has not fled for refuge to the hope held out by the gospel: for, in this sense also, Jesus Christ is the end of the law for justification to them that believe.”—*“A Commentary and Critical Notes,” Adam Clarke, LL. D., on Rom. 7:13. New York: Lane and Scott, 1851.*

Bishop Simpson, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, supports this teaching thus:

“The law of God, in its great and solemn injunctions, should be distinctly set forth. Our congregations should be gathered as around the base of Mt. Sinai, while from its summit is heard the voice of God in those commandments which are unalterable and eternal in their character. . . .

“Some will object to the sternness of the law, and say, ‘Prophesy smooth things;’ but still the law must be preached. It brings the sinner to a recognition of his sins, in having transgressed God’s holy law, and shows him the fearfulness of the doom which is impending over him. The law must be followed by the gospel; the awakened sinner must be pointed to the Saviour, that he may see that, deep as are the stains of his transgressions, the blood of Christ can wash them all away.”—*“Lectures on Preaching,” Bishop Matthew Simpson, Lecture 4, p. 128. New York; Eaton and Mains, 1906.*

“There are many preachers who love to dwell on the gospel alone. They talk sweetly and beautifully of the fatherhood of God. This is well. It is more than well, it is essential. But sometimes they go beyond this, and declaim against the preaching of the law,—intimate that it belongs to a past age, a less civilized society. . . .

“Such a gospel may rear a beautiful structure; but its foundation is on the sand. No true edifice can be raised without its foundations being dug deep by repentance toward God, and then shall the rock be reached, and the building shall be through faith in Jesus Christ. The law without the gospel is dark and hopeless; the gospel without the law is inefficient and powerless.”—*Id., p. 129.*

Also Dr. Albert Barnes (Presbyterian) agrees that Christians are bound by the ten commandments:

"We learn hence: 1. That all the law of God is binding on Christians. Compare James 2:10. 2. That all the commands of God should be preached in their proper place, by Christian ministers. 3. That they who pretend that there are any laws of God so small that they need not obey them, are unworthy of His kingdom. And 4. That true piety has respect to *all* the commandments of God. Compare Ps. 119:6."—"Commentary." *Rev. Albert Barnes, on the Gospels, note on Matt. 5:19, revised ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1868.*

The editor of the *Sunday School Times* agrees:

"While God remains God, His moral law will be binding upon all who would have any part in His life. God's moral law is eternal; it is an expression of His very being. As such it can no more be abrogated than can God Himself."—*Editorial in the Sunday School Times, January 3, 1914.*

Let us turn also to the official statement of Presbyterianism (Cumberland) regarding the binding claims of the ten commandments. Note the following emphatic declaration:

"The moral law is the rule of duty growing immediately out of the relations of rational creatures to their Creator and to each other. . . . This law is of universal and perpetual obligation. . . . This law is not set aside but rather established by the gospel. . . . It accordingly remains in full force as the rule of conduct."—*Presbyterian Confession of Faith,* pp. 43-45.

Again, let us turn to the teachings of John Wesley:

"The ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the temple, our Lord indeed did come to destroy, to dissolve, and utterly abolish. To this bear all the apostles witness. . . . This 'handwriting of ordinances' our Lord did blot out, take away, and nail to His cross. [Col. 2:14.]

"But the moral law contained in the ten commandments, and enforced by the prophets, He did not take away. It was not the design of His coming to revoke any part of this. This is a law which never can be broken, which 'stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven.' The moral law stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law. . . . Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind and in all ages; as not depending either on time, or place, or any other circum-

stance liable to change; but on the nature of God and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.”—“*Sermons on Several Occasions, Sermon XXV, “On the Sermon on the Mount”* (2 vol. ed.), Vol. I, pp. 221, 222. New York: Waugh & Mason, 1836.

“In the highest rank of the enemies of the gospel of Christ, are they who, openly and explicitly, ‘judge the law,’ itself, and ‘speak evil of the law;’ who teach men to break (*loose, to dissolve, to loose, to untie* the obligation of) not one only, whether of the least or of the greatest, but all the commandments at a stroke; who teach, without any cover, in so many words, ‘What did our Lord do with the law? He abolished it. There is but one duty, which is that of believing. . . .’ This is indeed carrying matters with a high hand; this is withstanding our Lord to the face, and telling Him that He understood not how to deliver the message on which He was sent. O Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!

“The most surprising of all the circumstances that attend this strong delusion is, that they who are given up to it really believe that they honor Christ by overthrowing His law, and that they are magnifying His office while they are destroying His doctrine! Yea, they honor Him just as Judas did, when he said, ‘Hail, Master,’ and kissed Him. And He may as justly say to every one of them, ‘Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?’ It is no other than betraying Him with a kiss to talk of His blood and take away His crown; to set light by any part of His law, under pretense of advancing His gospel. Nor indeed can any one escape this charge who preaches faith in any such a manner as either directly or indirectly tends to set aside any branch of obedience; who preaches Christ so as to disannul, or weaken in any wise, the least of the commandments of God.”—“*Works of Wesley, Sermon XXV, (7 vol. ed.) Vol. I, pp. 225, 226. New York: Waugh & Mason, 1833.*

Let us very carefully note again the category in which Mr. Wesley placed those who thus openly attack the law of God and teach men to disregard its precepts:

“*In the highest rank of the enemies of the gospel of Christ, are they who, openly and explicitly, ‘judge the law,’ itself, and ‘speak evil of the law;’ who teach men to break . . . not one only . . . but all the commandments at a stroke. . . . This is indeed carrying matters with a high hand; this is withstanding our Lord to the face.*”—*Ibid.*

And yet this is just what Mr. Canright taught after he broke his connection with the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and was

accepted by the Baptist denomination in Michigan, and ordained to preach his no-law doctrine to communicants of the Baptist faith! Would early Baptists have thus accepted him and indorsed his new teaching?

It was not, therefore, Seventh-day Adventism merely that Mr. Canright renounced, but the eternal law of God. Of this law Jesus said:

“Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. 5:18, 19.

Or, as Weymouth in his translation puts it:

“Solemnly I tell you that until heaven and earth pass away, *not one iota or smallest detail* will pass away from the law until all has taken place. Whoever therefore breaks one of these least commandments and teaches others to break them, will be called the least in the kingdom of the heavens.”—“*The New Testament in Modern Speech*,” by Richard Francis Weymouth.

ENEMIES OF THE LAW

But, sad to say, Mr. Canright has not been alone in this attempt to nullify the law of Jehovah. We live in a lawless age. Men are not only trying to remove the restraints of the law of God, but to get rid of God Himself. Infidelity openly stalks in the pulpit, and skepticism sits in the pew. Men are losing their former sense of sin. They no longer feel the need of a sin-pardoning Saviour. They are therefore rejecting the doctrine of the atonement, the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, and are telling us that Jesus was only a man, although a peer among His fellows. The evolutionary theory has robbed God of the glory of the original creation, and removed the evidence of His power for regeneration. Naturally, men who accept these heresies would desire to be rid of a law which purports to have come from a God who, in their reckoning, does not exist. This no-law doctrine is a fitting

companion to the evolutionary, modernistic teaching that has lately spread throughout Christendom as an overwhelming flood.

But has the church which has thus abandoned God's moral precepts grown more holy? Has it progressed more rapidly in its conquest of the world for Christ? Are its converts truer Christians than were those made by the church in the days when the decalogue was held up as the standard of a final judgment before the great white throne? Is the world growing better under this no-law, no-atonement preaching? Is it? We will permit Mr. William T. Ellis to reply to these queries as we quote from an article published by him in the *Washington Post*, July 15, 1919:

"What portends this turbulence of our time, which has swept around the earth like a seismic current? With so much that was for ages accepted going now into the scrap heap, are we to discard also the teachings of our mothers and of the Book they taught us to revere? Is a new philosophy of life, a new creed of religion, to be forged in the day's superheated furnace of unrest? Shall we look for a herald of a better social order who will bear in his hand a different code of laws for the regulation of man's relationship with man, and with the Unseen? Is there to come out of Russia or out of Germany a working faith for a revolutionized world?"

"With all the honesty of soul I possess I have sought to see straight into the causes and character of conditions. Turn whichever way I will, follow whatever set of conditions I can call to mind (and I have had recent personal experience of Bolshevized Russia, of proud and discontented Europe, of sullen and menacing Asia), I find myself led straight up to the mount of the law. Here is the answer to every question. *Things have gone wrong because . . . people have departed from this law.* They will never get right until . . . people have the clarity of vision and the courage to turn to the keeping of the ten words spoken on Sinai."

"Let us confess the truth. . . . We have wandered from the straight paths of our fathers, and have turned aside from the simple faith that made them great. . . ."

"Is there any one of the ten commandments that we as a civilization have not openly, flagrantly, and shamelessly violated, in disdain of God and in disregard of the proved social utility of these laws?"

"A universal acceptance of the ten commandments, together with the summary of the law given by Jesus, would straightway,

overnight, relax the tension of the times, settle revolutions, and bring in that better day toward which the world is blindly and violently groping. . . . The path runs straight as a sunbeam from the granite crest of 'Jebel Musa,' Mt. Sinai. The master word is here: 'Keep ye the law, be swift in all obedience.' . . . The ten commandments are an exposition of universal justice."

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS FUNDAMENTALISTS

Seventh-day Adventists are absolute Fundamentalists. As has already been pointed out, they hold strictly to all the great fundamentals of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They have nothing in common with Modernists, who would remove the foundation stones of the plan of redemption. They are endeavoring, through the grace of God, to fulfill the words of the Master, spoken through John the revelator, when He said of those who were to be called out of the nations and tribes of earth in preparation for His second advent: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. Or, as rendered by Goodspeed: "On this fact rests the endurance of God's people, who obey God's commands and cling to their faith in Jesus."

The teachings of this church, therefore, are not some new-fangled theories, novelties just discovered, but rather a going back to the "old paths," a restoration of precious truths lost through the great apostasy of the Dark Ages, but necessary to be restored to the people of God, that they may be in readiness when Christ comes. When He comes He will find a "remnant" waiting for Him, who will be without "spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing," yes, "without fault before the throne of God." Eph. 5:27; Rev. 14:5.

Seventh-day Adventists do not admit that they are the "troublers of Israel." When Elijah was accused by King Ahab of having troubled Israel, the prophet replied: "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." 1 Kings 18:18.

This, then, is our answer to the charge that the Seventh-day Adventist teachings confuse the people. There is no confusion so long as men believe in God and obey His law. The only confused ones are those who prefer to follow a tradition that makes void the law of the Most High. And we submit that Mr. Canright's confusion began when he renounced the binding claims of the decalogue, and not when he, by the grace of God, was obedient to the divine law. Mr. Canright did not advance from darkness to light when he repudiated Seventh-day Adventism, but the light that was in him evidently became darkness. (See Matt. 6:23.) "It shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." "And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways." Deut. 28:15, 29.

MR. CANRIGHT'S CONFESSION

The strangest thing of all in connection with Mr. Canright's case is the fact that he must have fully realized that in repudiating Adventism he was going from light into darkness, as is evidenced by a confession made by him after one of his disaffection experiences, when he, for a time, gave up preaching, but was still a member of the Adventist Church. This disaffection took place about 1882, and for some two years Mr. Canright worked on a farm. In 1884 he accepted an invitation to attend some general meetings to be held in Michigan by the Seventh-day Adventists, and while there he made a voluntary public confession which was afterward published by him in the *Review and Herald*, the Seventh-day Adventist official church organ, in the issue bearing the date, October 7, 1884. In this confession he said in part:

"Most of the readers of the REVIEW know the part which I have acted in this cause for many years, both in preaching and in

writing. They also know that for two years past I have dropped out of the work."

Then, after speaking of certain reproofs that were given him because of a wrong course he was taking in the conduct of his work, he adds:

"This I did not receive at all well, but felt hard toward Sister White, and soon quit the work entirely. . . . So I went to farming, resolved to live a devoted life, and to do all I could that way. But I soon found my doubts and fears increasing and my devotion decreasing, till at length I found myself largely swallowed up in my work, with little time, taste, or interest for religious work. . . . *So it always is when a person lets go of one point of the truth,—he begins to drift, he knows not whither.*

"A short time since I attended the north Michigan camp meeting with Elder Butler. Here we had a long time for consultation, prayer, and careful examination of my difficulties. I began to see that at least some of my objections were not tenable, *and that I myself was not right and in the light.* . . . I saw that I had put a wrong meaning on some things, and that other things were certainly true. If these were true, then *I had certainly been wrong all the way through.* . . . Everything looked different. *Then I felt how wrong, sinful, and in the dark I had been.* My sins came up before me as never before in all my life. Like Job I cried, 'Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.' . . .

"Friday, September 26, while on the camp ground at Jackson, Michigan, I felt in my heart the most remarkable change that I ever experienced in all my life. It was a complete reversion of all my feelings. *Light and faith* came into my soul, and I felt that God had given me another heart. I never felt such a change before, not even when first converted. . . . *I believe it was directly from heaven—the work of the Spirit of God.* I now believe the message as firmly and more understandingly than ever before. . . . Such nearness to God, such earnest devotion, such solemn appeals to live a holy life, *can only be prompted by the Spirit of God.* Where that is, there I want to be. *I am fully satisfied* that my own salvation and my usefulness in saving others depends upon my being connected with this people and this work, and here I take my stand to risk all I am, or have, or hope for, in this life and the life to come, with this people and this work."

This remarkable statement was published by Mr. Canright only a little more than two years before he became grieved again at some of his associates, and finally dropped out of the

Seventh-day Adventist Church altogether. He immediately began to advocate the doctrines which he had declared only two years before to be darkness. In the above confession he graphically relates how the "Spirit of God" had led him out of the darkness of his fears and doubts and hard feelings, and had restored him to the light. He was led to feel "how wrong, sinful, and in the dark" he had been. He had had a new conversion, and was convinced that his salvation depended upon his connection with this people and this work. Said he, "I believe it was directly from heaven—the work of the Spirit of God."

Let the reader remember that the above words were not uttered and published by the "mere boy, uneducated, with no knowledge of the Bible, of history, or of other churches," that Mr. Canright represents himself to have been when he first became a Seventh-day Adventist, but by a seasoned minister of some twenty-six years' experience, and only some two years before he finally left the church and posed before the world as the great expositor of Seventh-day Adventist errors!

WHAT SPIRIT?

If, therefore, the *Spirit of God* led Mr. Canright back into the light in October, 1884, and placed in his heart a settled conviction that Seventh-day Adventism was truth, what spirit was it that led him to renounce this light on February 17, 1887, two years and four months later? Could the same spirit have led him on both occasions? He was certain in 1884 that the experience that came to him and which fully settled him in the Adventist faith was "directly from heaven—the work of the Spirit of God." Whence, then, came the change two years and four months later, which led him to repudiate this whole experience? Does he claim this also to be from heaven and the work of God's Spirit? Is, then, God divided against Himself, leading men one way today and another way tomorrow?

And if Mr. Canright was in the "light" in 1884, when he became fully settled in the Seventh-day Adventist faith, what was he in when he renounced it two years later? Should it be said that when he left the Adventists he had had his eyes opened and saw clearly that he had been in darkness all the time that he was connected with them, we would reply that only two years and four months before, he tells of having felt in his heart the most remarkable change he had ever experienced in all his life; it is described as a wonderful work of God, direct from heaven, an experience that could "only be prompted by the Spirit of God," which fully satisfied him with the Seventh-day Adventist doctrines, and caused him to take his stand, to risk all he was or had or hoped for, in this life and the life to come, with the Seventh-day Adventist people and their work.

Which experience, therefore, shall we take to be genuine? If he was mistaken in the first instance, can we be sure that he was right in the second? If he was right in the 1884 experience, then he must have been wrong in the 1887 experience. At any rate, can a man who thus frequently changes his mind and who has so many conflicting experiences, all of which he in turn attributes to the Holy Spirit, be a safe guide for other men in religious matters? We think not, and we believe that our readers will also seriously question his qualifications as a spiritual counselor and interpreter of the word and will of God.

In our reply to Mr. Canright's arguments against the moral law and the seventh-day Sabbath we shall follow quite largely the plan of permitting him to answer himself, by comparing what he wrote upon these subjects while he was still a Seventh-day Adventist preacher, with what he later said in his book, "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced." His former statements in support of the enduring claims of the decalogue and the original seventh-day Sabbath are so clear and convincing and so full of Bible proof, whereas his later arguments against these doctrines are so confusing and unbiblical, that we feel sure

a careful comparison of the two will readily serve to convince any candid reader that in renouncing Seventh-day Adventism, Mr. Canright went from clear light into dense darkness.

It is of such persons we are warned by Isaiah the prophet when he said:

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” “Because they have *cast away the law of the Lord of hosts*, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” Isa. 5:20, 24.

CHAPTER II

THE LAW OF GOD

MR. CANRIGHT'S chief attacks are leveled at the moral law of God as contained in the decalogue, the ten commandments. From among his many declarations on this point, we select the following as typical:

"Now, under Christ, we are delivered from the law; that law is dead."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 331.

"The letter of the law is not binding upon Christians as a coercive code."—*Id.*, p. 330.

"We have something better than the decalogue."—*Id.*, p. 355.

MR. CANRIGHT ANSWERS HIMSELF

We will contrast with these bold statements the following paragraphs chosen from a pamphlet on this subject published by D. M. Canright while he still regarded the law of God as holy, and while he was still a Seventh-day Adventist preacher. Let the reader note how definitely he answers himself on this subject:

"The law of God is that which should be our rule of action here, and certainly will be our rule of judgment hereafter. What is this law? and how came we by it? We learn from the Scriptures that the living God came down upon Mt. Sinai in the most terrible majesty; and there, in the presence of a whole nation, spoke this sacred law with His own voice, which then shook the earth. Deut. 4:12, 13; Heb. 12:26.

"This is the law of God—the ten commandments. Let us examine it. 1. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me. 2. Thou shalt not make an image and worship it. 3. Thou shalt not profane the Lord's name. 4. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. 5. Honor thy father and thy mother. 6. Thou shalt not kill. 7. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 8. Thou shalt not steal. 9. Thou shalt not bear false witness. 10. Thou shalt not covet. How simple, and yet how comprehensive! The first four precepts relate to our duty to God, embracing in short all that we owe to Him. The

last six relate to our duty to our fellow men, summarily covering all our relations to one another.

"Reader, if this law were strictly observed in this community, would it not produce an excellent state of society? There would be no idolatry, profanity, Sabbath breaking, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, stealing, or lying. Who would not wish to live in such a community? This is the law for which we plead. These principles have always existed since God made man upon the earth. They were as binding upon the antediluvians as upon the Jews, *and they are as obligatory now as then.*

"We can conceive of no nation, generation, or individual that could violate these precepts with impunity. *This law is as eternal and unchangeable as the Creator.* John says, 'All unrighteousness is sin.' 1 John 5:17. 'Sin is the transgression of the law.' Chap. 3:4. Paul says, 'Where no law is, there is no transgression' (Rom. 4:15); and, 'Sin is not imputed when there is no law.' Chap. 5:13. Hence, where we find unrighteousness and sin imputed to men, we know that the law was binding. . . .

"The Bible explicitly and repeatedly declares that all these commandments shall stand forever. 'All His commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever.' Ps. 111:7, 8. Again, 'Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them forever.' 'Every one of Thy righteous judgments endureth forever.' Ps. 119:152, 160.

JESUS, OUR EXAMPLE, KEPT THE LAW

"The prophet, speaking of Jesus, says, 'He will magnify the law, and make it honorable.' Isa. 42:21. Then we shall expect Jesus to keep this law, and honor it in all His ways and teachings; and so we find He did. He says Himself, 'I have kept My Father's commandments, and abide in His love.' John 15:10. The holy Son of God paid the greatest deference to His Father's law, and devotedly obeyed every one of the ten commandments. What gives this greater force is the fact that He did this as our example. Hence the apostle says, 'He that saith, I know Him, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.' 'He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk even as He walked.' 1 John 2:4, 6. *This is very plain. Christians should walk as their Master walked. He kept this law of God. If they claim to be His followers, and do not keep the commandments of God, the apostle says they are liars.*

"Instead of being abolished, changed, loosened, or in any manner altered in the New Testament, the law of God is, on the other hand, confirmed and established in the most solemn manner by Christ Himself and by all His apostles. At the very opening of His ministry, Jesus said, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the

law or the prophets.' Matt. 5:17. He is anxious that they should not have a wrong impression on this all-important subject. He had not come to destroy the law. This was no part of His mission. The devil and wicked men hate the law of God, and would rejoice to see it destroyed; but the mission of Jesus was exactly the opposite of this. He says, 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.' To fulfill is to obey.—*Webster*. (See also Gal. 6:2.) Christ came, then, not to destroy the law, but to obey it; and this is just what He did.

"In stronger language the Saviour continues: 'For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' Matt. 5:18. How could language be stronger? Heaven and earth have not passed yet. But till they do, not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law—not one. Every precept shall stand. Not even a letter, or the corner of a letter, shall be changed till heaven and earth shall pass away, yea, longer, till all (all things) are fulfilled. Christ is speaking of the law and the prophets, and He says till these are all fulfilled, the whole law shall stand. But all the prophets will not be fulfilled, even when heaven and earth pass away. No, not till the eternal kingdom is reached. Thus in the strongest language, Jesus teaches that every precept in the law will be in force until we shall reach the eternal world. He confirms this position with the following solemn words: 'Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.' Verse 19. How sacred was every one of these commandments in the eyes of the divine Son of God! Not the least one of them can be disregarded. Reader, if you are breaking one of these commandments and teaching others to do the same, how will you meet these words of the Master in the judgment? . . .

EVERY COMMAND STILL BINDING

"James teaches the same simple truth, *that every one of the ten commandments is binding upon Christians*. He says, 'For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' James 2:10. Of what law is he speaking? The ten commandments, as he proceeds to show in the very next verse: 'For He that said [marginal reading, that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.' James is speaking of that law which says, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery. We all know that this law is the decalogue, for it is the only law which contains this language. Wherever these words are quoted in the New Testament, they are quoted directly from the decalogue as contained in the Old Testament.

Now James says positively that whoever shall keep the whole of that law, that is, nine of the ten commandments, and break any one of them, he is guilty of all. He has broken the law. He is a transgressor, and God will hold him guilty. How could the sacredness and perpetuity of that law be taught in stronger language? People who can explain this away, can explain away anything.

"These commandments are constantly appealed to, not only in the Old Testament, but just as frequently in the New Testament, as the standard of right and wrong, of moral character; as that which shows who is righteous and who is wicked. When the young man asked Christ what he should do to inherit eternal life, the Saviour's answer was, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' Matt. 19:17. Thus the Lord held up before him the commandments of God as the condition of eternal life. That He here referred to the ten commandments is evident, for He immediately proceeded to quote several of them to show what law He meant.

"When Jesus would prove the Pharisees to be hypocrites and wicked men, He brought the same test to bear upon them. 'Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother.' Matt. 15:3, 4. Here the decalogue is plainly referred to. The Saviour then says, 'In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Verse 9. It is vain for us, then, to profess to worship God, and yet disregard any precept of His holy law. . . .

"Throughout the New Testament this law is spoken of in the highest terms. Paul, referring to the decalogue (Rom. 7:7), says, 'Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.' 'For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.' 'For I delight in the law of God.' Rom. 7:12, 14, 22. This was the character of that law at the time Paul wrote, which was 60 A. D. He does not say it used to be holy and good; but it 'is holy,' 'is spiritual,' etc. The holy apostle says, 'I delight in the law of God.' Should we not do the same? The apostle adds: 'The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.' Rom. 8:7.

"Reader, God's law is just right: the trouble is with the carnal heart. It does not love to obey that law. How is it with yourself? Do you love to meditate upon that law? Do you observe its precepts? Or are you breaking some of these commandments? Remember that one of them plainly requires you to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. We beseech you not to regard this matter lightly, nor condemn us for teaching and keeping the law of God just as the Bible presents it. We solemnly believe that the time has come for a reformation concerning the commandments of God, as predicted in the last message (Rev. 14:12): 'Here are they that keep

the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.' Just before Jesus comes, a people is to be raised up who will keep all the commandments of God, while they also have faith in Jesus. This is just what we see fulfilled in the work of Seventh-day Adventists." —*"The Law of God,"* by D. M. Canright.

CHRIST MAGNIFIES THE LAW

The following paragraphs also were written by Mr. Canright before he renounced the moral law. In these he clearly shows that Christ did not abolish the ten commandments, but greatly magnified and confirmed them. Thus again he answers himself :

"We will now briefly examine what is said of the law of God. The psalmist says, 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.' Ps. 19:7. Since it came from a perfect being, we should naturally expect it to be perfect. Of the extent of this law we read: 'Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.' Eccl. 12:13. The requirements of God's law extend to every moral duty of man. The decalogue is, of course, but a brief epitome of these duties, while all the moral precepts of the Old Testament, and of the New also, are but the further explanation of it, and continue in force with it. Of this law the Lord says, 'I gave them My statutes, and showed them My judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in them.' Eze. 20:11.

"Speaking of the effect of Christ's mission upon the law, the prophet says, 'He will magnify the law, and make it honorable.' Isa. 42:21. Did He magnify the law by abolishing it? Did He make it honorable by doing it away? No, indeed. Listen to His own words as He shows how His coming was to affect the law (Matt. 5:17-28): 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets.' He is careful at the very opening of His ministry to disclaim any intention of destroying the law. 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.' To fulfill is to keep. Gal. 6:2. 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.' Is a law ended when it is fulfilled? Then the law of Christ was abolished in the apostles' time. No; to fulfill a law is to keep it. (See also Rom. 2:25-27; James 2:8-12.) So Jesus came to obey the law, not to break or abolish it.

"That it is the ten commandments of which He is speaking, He shows by quoting two of them to illustrate what He means (verses 21, 27): 'Thou shalt not kill,' and 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' Where are these words to be found? Nowhere in all the Old Testament except in the decalogue. Hence it is certain that this is the law of which He is speaking. . . .

“Jesus then takes two of those commandments, and comments on them to show how broad is their application: ‘Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.’ Does He abolish that commandment? He does that which is just the opposite: He shows that it extends farther than to the outward act. He simply states what had always been true of it, though not explained so clearly before. Thus He magnified the law, and made it honorable. How different this language is from that which we have found used when the ceremonial law was spoken of! So we shall find it all the way through. . . .

“Every time the decalogue, or any one of the ten commandments, is mentioned in the New Testament, it is honored, exalted, and enforced; while on the other hand, the law of ordinances is always spoken of as being of no further importance. Notice a few examples. When the Pharisees asked Jesus why He transgressed the tradition of the elders in not washing His hands before eating, He said unto them, ‘Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother; and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites! well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoreth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me. But in vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.’ Matt. 15:1-9.

“Jesus quoted the fifth commandment, and then severely reprobated the Pharisees for making this void. He says that all their other worship is in vain as long as they disregard one of these commandments. . . .

“Finally, Paul concludes his argument on the decalogue thus: ‘Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.’ Rom. 3:31.

“Here we take our stand. The apostle’s statement is positive, clear, and decisive. *The law is not abolished.* . . .

“In Romans 7, Paul again refers to the ten commandments (verse 7): ‘I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.’ This is a quotation from the tenth commandment, showing what law he means. Of this law he says (verse 12), ‘Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.’ How could he exalt that law in higher terms than this? Nor does he say that it used to be holy, but he says, ‘the law is

holy.' It was still holy, just, and good, when he was writing, thirty years after the resurrection. Again he says of it (verse 14), 'For we know that the law is spiritual.' Again (verse 22), 'For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.' Could Paul have said all this of an old abolished law, which at the best was a yoke of bondage, which was against us, and contrary to us? No, indeed. . . .

"The testimony of James in favor of the ten commandments is plain and strong. Chap. 2:8-12. 'If ye fulfill the royal law [royal, kingly, the law of the great King] according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well.' It requires love to fulfill the law, hence in keeping it we must remember this principle. 'But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' Now he will show of what law he is speaking: 'For He that said [margin, "that law which said"], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.' Here James quotes the sixth and seventh of the ten commandments, the only law which says what he here quotes. Thus he directly enforces that law, and all of it, too, for he says that whoever keeps the whole of that law and yet offends in one point is guilty of all. Then the whole ten are binding and must be kept. Hence he adds: 'So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.' *Then men will be judged by this law in the judgment.* It is properly called the 'law of liberty,' because those who keep it are not condemned, but are free from sin. Thus David says, 'I will walk at liberty: for I seek Thy precepts.' Ps. 119:45.

"John also says, 'This is the love of God, that we keep His commandments.' 1 John 5:3. Describing the saints who live at the second advent, the Lord says, 'Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.' Rev. 14:12. The faith of Jesus embraces the gospel, the teachings of Christ. The commandments are those of God the Father—His moral law, the ten commandments. And, finally, in the very last revelation we have from Jesus, which we find in Revelation 22:14, He especially mentions His Father's commandments, and pronounces a blessing upon those who keep them. 'Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'

"Thus we see that whenever the ten commandments are mentioned, or any one of them, either by Jesus or His apostles, they are always praised, exalted, and enforced. That law is held up as the standard of life, the test of character, and the rule of judgment."—*"The Two Laws,"* by D. M. Canright, pp. 87-97, ed. 1886.

Can any candid mind turn lightly from the truth thus clearly stated by Mr. Canright, buttressed as it is in its every detail by a "Thus saith the Lord," and in its stead accept his later teaching, that "the law is not binding upon Christians;" that it "is dead;" and that "we have something better than the decalogue"? We think not.

THE SCRIPTURES VERSUS MR. CANRIGHT

Let us briefly compare some of Mr. Canright's later statements concerning the law with what is said of it in the Scriptures.

Canright, after renouncing the law of God, said:

"That law is dead."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 33^r.

"The letter of the law is not binding upon Christians as a coercive code."—*Id.*, p. 330.

"We have something better than the decalogue."—*Id.*, p. 355.

But God, by the mouth of the prophet Isaiah, says:

"O that thou hadst hearkened to My commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isa. 48:18.

David also speaks of it thus:

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." Ps. 19:7, 8.

"It is time for Thee, Lord, to work: for they have made void Thy law." Ps. 119:126.

"My tongue shall speak of Thy word: for all Thy commandments are righteousness." Ps. 119:172.

Solomon adds this testimony:

"The commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life." Prov. 6:23.

Jesus declares:

"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law. . . . Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." Matt. 5:17, 18.

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19:17.

Paul testifies:

"I had not known sin, but by the law." Rom. 7:7.

"Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

James tells us:

"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:10-12.

John the Beloved adds this:

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14.

Surely these patriarchs, prophets, and disciples of our Lord did not in any wise agree with Mr. Canright's renunciation of the moral law as a guide for God's children. Nor do his teachings agree with those of Jesus.

Mr. Canright declares "the law is dead."

Jesus replies, "I came not to destroy the law;" and it will endure as long as heaven and earth remain. Paul declares that faith has not made it void.

Mr. Canright says, "We have something better than the decalogue."

David replies, "The law of the Lord is perfect." And Paul adds, "The law is holy." Now all these statements simply cannot be true. If a thing is perfect and holy, then nothing else can be better. A thing cannot excel perfection, for perfection cannot be improved upon. A thing cannot advance from holiness to greater purity. Therefore there is a very wide divergence here between the teachings of Mr. Canright after he renounced the divine law, and the words of David, Jesus, and

Paul. Mr. Canright takes the position that the ten commandments have been improved upon, that we have something better. But note again that David and Paul declare the decalogue to be perfect and holy, and therefore not capable of improvement. It is therefore not merely with Seventh-day Adventism that Mr. Canright's argument is in conflict, but with the writers of both the Old and New Testaments, and with the Lord Himself. Surely he must have joined the class of which Jesus said, "Howbeit in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandments of God, ye hold the tradition of men." Mark. 7:7, 8.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIONS RAISED TO THE MORAL LAW

AFTER Mr. Canright began to wage relentless warfare against the moral law of God, he resorted to the very arguments against it which he had so completely demolished in his former publications. Let us note a few of them. He says:

"The law was given only to the Jews."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 320.

We answer, then the rest of us are free from any of the restraints of the law. We can lie, steal, swear, etc., with impunity. We, being Gentiles instead of Jews, are not bound by any restrictions on these points. Only the Jews were to restrain their fleshly lusts and put to death the carnal mind. Mr. Canright would not have admitted this, yet the logic of his argument would lead to just this conclusion; for, says Paul, "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. And again, "Sin is not imputed where there is no law." Rom. 5:13. Well, then, according to Mr. Canright, the Gentiles are entirely free from lawful restraint. No law, no restrictions, therefore no sin; for "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. We are Christians, people of another race and dispensation; we are free!

May we inquire of the reader whether he would like to locate in a community of Christians(?) who actually lived what Mr. Canright taught concerning the ten commandments after he renounced Adventism; a place where people felt themselves entirely liberated from any obligation to keep the ten commandments; where there was no restraint against murder, theft, adultery, false witness, covetousness, Sabbath breaking, idol-

atry, swearing, etc.? Even a heathen would not be willing to risk his life, family, and property in such a place. Think of it! No law of God! Do just as you please. Just remember that the Jews were the ones who had to be restrained. Surely this line of reasoning is preposterous, and a travesty on the Christian religion.

THE ESSENCE OF THE LAW

But Mr. Canright has found that the law had an "essence." This essence was something inside of the outer shell called the law, and was the real thing that mattered—the kernel of the wheat, so to speak. We read:

"Yet not one jot or one tittle of the *essence* of the moral law is abated. When Paul, referring to the abolishment of the law dispensation, said: "For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious," he indicated the correct status of the law. The *essence* of the moral law "remaineth." This is exactly what I believe."—*Id.*, p. 333.

Now here is something quite new. The Jews had only the letter of the law, but we have the essence! Mr. Canright has already stated on page 330 of his book that "the *letter* of the law is not binding upon Christians," but now he informs us that we do have the *essence*. Seems a bit hard on the Jews, doesn't it? They had to deal with a law, even in the letter, but according to this we Christians have no code, no letter of the law, no set rule of conduct, but just an essence. It may perhaps be felt that codes are a bit difficult to manage; they say such definite things, demand certain measures of obedience, and thereby become, in the estimation of some, a yoke of bondage! But a mere essence is different! With an essence only, one cannot be pinned down to any definite measure of service or standard of life. Almost any form may be right. One man's interpretation of the standard of morality is as good as another's, where there is no letter of the law to guide them, but only an essence.

What would we say of a nation which decided to abolish all its laws and destroy its statute books, leaving it entirely with

its citizens to obey what they considered to be the "essence" of morality? Such a nation could abolish its lawmaking assemblies, disband its police force, tear down its jails, and proclaim absolute liberty of action to its citizens. Where no law is, there could be no proof of guilt, and therefore no infliction of punishment. Every man would determine for himself what was right or wrong, and would live under no restraint whatsoever from the state. But who would want to live in such a country? What protection would there be of life or property? None whatever. Such a nation could not possibly survive.

ESSENCE OF THE LAW EXAMINED

There is a very strange thing about Mr. Canright's "essence" of the law. It seems that after the letter and code disappeared, this essence looked just like the former law, but for the fact that it had a new rest day. On this point he says:

"Excepting the Sabbath, the other nine commandments are in the New Testament, either in the same words or in substance."—*Id.*, p. 362.

And again:

"The observance of the Lord's day [Sunday] meets the spirit of the fourth commandment."—*Id.*, p. 332.

So this essence is beginning to take shape again, and, lo! it appears just like the old abolished *letter of the law* which the Jews had, except for this one point: it has Sunday for a rest day instead of the original seventh-day Sabbath!

The point seems to be that this "essence" stage of the law was intended by Mr. Canright to cover only a brief transition period. Some means had to be found by which to get rid of the true Sabbath, so the dissolving-view effect was resorted to. The whole law was made to fade out into an "essence." Then a waving of the wand, a command from the juggler, and, lo! it takes definite form again—changes back into real substance, but the holy Sabbath of God has disappeared, and the first day of the week has taken its place!

While Mr. Canright was still a Sabbath observer, he wrote as follows regarding the argument that nine of the ten commandments are re-enacted in the New Testament, but that the fourth one is left out. Note how fully Mr. Canright answers himself. At that time he said:

“Those who hold this theory teach that all the ten commandments were abolished at the cross, and nine of the ten re-enacted at the same instant!

“Of course this must have been done simply to get rid of the Sabbath, as the law would have been all right, but for that.

“Or, as some claim, the law was abolished at the cross, and re-enacted at Pentecost, which leaves an interregnum of fifty days without any law at all. ‘Where no law is, there is no transgression.’ Rom. 4:15. All the crimes committed during those fifty days must go unpunished, as there was no law to condemn them! . . .

“The world was in rebellion against the law of the Father. God sent His Son to reconcile the world to Himself. Says Paul, ‘God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself.’ 2 Cor. 5:19. . . .

“Men cannot be judged by an abolished law; hence all those before the cross will go free in the judgment, having no law to condemn them. Will God judge the millions of Hebrews who lived from Moses to Christ by an old dead law which, according to our opponents, was always only a yoke of bondage, grievous to be borne? It would be a violation of every principle of law. Thus I read in the decision of the supreme court of Iowa, 1862 (*Iowa Reports*, Vol. XII, p. 311):

“‘The general principle relied upon, independent of some statutory rule, is not controverted, that when a statute is repealed it must be considered as if it had never existed, except with reference to such parts as are saved by the repealing statute.’ This refers to the criminal code, not to the civil law. But our opponents claim that all God’s law was abolished—no part saved. Hence it cannot be a rule in the judgment.

“It assumes that the decalogue has been abolished, when no record of its repeal can be found. Notice how carefully the record is made when even human laws are abolished:

“*Law repealed.* ‘Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, That section 2498 of the Revision of 1860, be and the same is hereby repealed.’ Approved Feb. 7, 1870.—*Session Laws of the Thirteenth General Assembly of Iowa*, p. 112.

“Let our opponents bring something like this for the repeal of God’s law, and we will believe them.

“Laws which are to decide the eternal destiny of billions of souls should be given in the plainest possible manner. They should not be left to inference and guesswork. Beyond dispute, God

did give one law—the decalogue. He delivered it in just that solemn, public, and definite manner which we would expect in so all-important a transaction.

“Our opponents claim that Jesus gave a new code of laws in place of the old, yet they can produce no record as to *when* it was given, *where* it was given, *how many* precepts it has, which is the *first*, or the *last*, *who* gave it, *to whom* it was given, what its *penalty* is, *wherein* it differs from the old, or any other particular.

“Of all documents, a law should be given in the plainest manner. *But in what book, chapter, and verse is this new law to be found?* Was it given during Christ’s life? was it at His death? or was it after His resurrection? Was it delivered in the temple, by the seaside, or elsewhere? Has it only nine commandments now, or has it a dozen? Which is the first commandment? Was it given in private, or in public? to the disciples, or to the world? Surely if this law has a real existence, all these questions ought to be easily answered. But the Bible reader knows that the New Testament is entirely silent upon all these questions. It neither knows nor says anything of such a new law.”—“*The Two Laws*,” by D. M. Canright, pp. 102-106.

FALLACY POINTED OUT

Farther on in this same work Mr. Canright points out the utter fallacy of his later argument that nine of the commandments which had been abolished were restored in the New Testament. On this point he said:

“Many, in their opposition to the Sabbath, carry the impression that all the commandments except the Sabbath are repeated word for word in the New Testament. But such is not the case. Neither the first, second, third, fourth, nor tenth commandments, are anywhere repeated in the New Testament. This is an important fact, as it shows that the New Testament does not give a new code of laws.

“The other five commandments, with a part of the tenth, are quoted in the following passages in the New Testament: Matt. 5:21-27; 15:4; 19:18, 19; Mark 7:10; 10:19; Luke 18:20; Rom. 7:7; 13:9; Eph. 6:2, 3; James 2:11. If, then, the Sabbath is not now obligatory because that commandment is not directly quoted in the New Testament, then also the first three are not now binding, and it is no sin to have other gods, worship images, or profane God’s name! To what a monstrous conclusion this theory leads! So it always will be found that every argument framed against the Sabbath comes with equal force against the other commandments.

“But yielding the point that there are several others of the ten commandments, as well as the Sabbath, not quoted at all in the New Testament, our opponents next claim that there were nine of the ten commandments re-enacted in the New Testament, not, indeed, in the very words of the old law, but in substance the same. It is painfully amusing to see them try to find these commandments as thus re-enacted. Here is the mode generally adopted: First commandment (1 John 5:21), ‘Keep yourselves from idols.’ How plain! But when was this written? Not until 90 A. D., or about sixty years after the resurrection. Here, then, were sixty years before the first commandment was re-enacted—sixty years in which there was no law against idolatry! If, to evade this terrible conclusion, it is admitted that this passage does not bring to view the time when, and the place where, this commandment was re-enacted, but only a reference to it as already existing, then the whole point is given up. For thereby they admit that they have no record of the time when, or place where, this was re-enacted. It only shows that there was a law against idolatry; and this is simply a reference to it as previously existing. Here they are compelled to admit the whole truth, and come squarely upon our ground. That commandment, with the time and place of its enactment, is nowhere to be found in the New Testament, but it is found in the decalogue. Ex. 20:3.

“It puzzles them very much to find the second commandment re-enacted in the New Testament. Matthew 22:37 is generally quoted as the nearest to the point, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.’ If a man loves God with all his heart, he will not worship any image. But try that a little further. Would he have other gods? No. Then this includes the first commandment. Would he profane God’s name? Certainly not. Would he violate God’s holy rest day? No. Then this includes the fourth commandment as well as the first three, and so proves too much for our opponents.

“But this language was spoken by Christ some time before His crucifixion, at which time they claim the old law was abolished. So they have a part of the law re-enacted before it is abolished! But the simple fact is, this is only a quotation by Christ from the Old Testament. The lawyer asked Him which was the great commandment in ‘the law’—the law already existing, not a new law which Christ should give. In answer to this, Jesus quotes directly from Deuteronomy 6:5, the great commandment to love God with all the heart, and from Leviticus 19:18, the second, to love your neighbor as yourself. If, therefore, the giving of these two great commandments was to supersede the decalogue, then it must have passed away in the days of Moses, 1500 B. C.!

“Look at the places where the other commandments are claimed to be regiven. In Matthew 19:16-19, Jesus, in answer to the young

man, quotes the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments just as found in the decalogue.

"This was no re-enactment of them, but simply a quotation from the law as already existing. This, too, was before the law is claimed to have been abolished; so that Christ re-enacted these before He abolished them, if indeed this be a reviving of them!

"So Paul, in Romans 13:9, quotes five of the ten commandments. This also is seized upon as a re-enactment of those commandments. But were they re-enacted both by Jesus and by Paul, and then again by James? Chap. 2:8-12. How can any candid man for a moment maintain such a position?

"How plain is the simple fact that both Christ and the apostles were only quoting from the law, before given by God the Father, than whom there could be no higher authority.

"It is claimed that nine are referred to while the fourth is not; but this is false. *The Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament oftener than any other of the ten commandments, being not less than fifty-nine times in all.* It is worthy of notice that in all these numerous references not one word is spoken derogatory to the honor and sacredness which it had always possessed."—*"The Two Laws,"* by D. M. Canright, pp. 117-120.

AN ASTONISHING CHANGE

How utterly astonishing it is to find this same man only a few years later setting forth the very arguments which he himself had so completely overthrown.

The one thing Mr. Canright, in his later theory regarding the "essence" of the law, failed to inform us about, was when this new rest day (Sunday) came in after the law was abolished and reshaped. This point was entirely overlooked. We would like to see the chapter and verse cited. Where, we ask, are we informed in the Scripture that Christ took away one Sabbath and gave Christians another? Where does the Bible say that the *old law* had a Sabbath, but that in the *essence* of the law given to Christians this part had been changed or dropped out? Where is Sunday, the first day of the week, called a Sabbath, a rest day, a holy day, or anything but a working day? It cannot be found in Scripture. It is not there. Had it been, Mr. Canright would, no doubt, have simply produced the text, thus settling the question and saving himself the necessity of cre-

ating this new "essence" theory as a means of ejecting the Sabbath from the law.

The fact is that Christians have no new moral law. The moral law is as much in force today as when it was spoken by God Himself from Sinai; and the fourth commandment, unchanged by a jot or a tittle, still declares: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." (See Ex. 20:8-11; Luke 23:56.)

WHY THE TEN COMMANDMENTS WERE GIVEN SEPARATE FROM THE ORDINANCES OF THE LAW OF MOSES

In his book, "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," Mr. Canright makes a desperate but entirely fruitless effort to prove that the decalogue was only a part of the ceremonial law of Moses. In order to show that they constitute only one law instead of two separate and distinct codes, it was necessary for Mr. Canright to overcome the impression created by the vastly different ways in which the two were given. One was spoken by God's own voice, written by His own finger on tables of stone, and deals with moral issues only; while the other was given through Moses, and was later written by him in a book, and dealt with rites and ceremonies, sanitary regulations, and civil relations.

But Mr. Canright soon found a way out. "It would have been impossible," he said, "to carry around the whole law if written on stones; hence only a few *samples* out of that law could have been selected and put on stones to be kept as a witness of that covenant."—"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 343.

Surely this is a strange argument! Think of it! The only thing that deterred God from writing all the ceremonies, rites, ordinances, etc., pertaining to the sacrificial service, was the size of the load it would have made to carry!

How unfortunate for Mr. Canright and those who share his opposition to the seventh-day Sabbath, that the fourth commandment crept in among the samples and got onto the tables of stone! How much easier it would have been to have brushed the Sabbath aside, had it gone into the book of the "law of Moses" instead! The very fact that it got in among the moral precepts of the decalogue and became a part of a strictly moral code, would naturally give the impression that it belonged in that class, and was not ceremonial in nature, as were the laws of Moses. But, of course, if God only picked up a few samples at random and wrote them down on tables of stone, anything might have gotten in.

But is this like God? Does the "Ancient of days" perform His work in such a careless manner? Would He give to men a rule of life and a standard of judgment, and then inform them that those He had given were only a few samples? Absolutely not. To argue thus is to charge God with folly. No, dear reader, the ten commandment law of God is not a makeshift. It is "perfect" (Ps. 19:7); therefore it is complete. It is "holy, and just, and good," (Rom. 7:12); therefore it cannot be improved upon. It is just as it should be, seventh-day Sabbath and all, and just as it will be when we stand before the throne of God at the judgment of the last great day, and find that this law is the standard by which our lives are to be measured. Hence the importance of heeding the admonition of James when he says: "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:12.

But let us permit Mr. Canright to answer himself. When he was still a Seventh-day Adventist, he wrote as follows:

"Those who deny the pre-eminence which we claim for the decalogue, can give no reason why the Lord singled out the ten commandments, and gave them in so conspicuous a manner as He did. All God's acts are in wisdom, and for a purpose. It was not by accident that He singled out and gave the decalogue as He did. Evidently He did it to honor that law above all others."—"*The Two Laws*," by D. M. Canright, p. 102.

NOT UNDER THE LAW, BUT UNDER GRACE

In a further effort to establish his no-law doctrine, Mr. Canright tries to find an argument for his theory in Paul's statement, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Rom. 6:14. On this he says:

"Several times Paul says directly that Christians are 'not under the law.' (See Rom. 6:14, 15; Gal. 3:23-25; 4:21; 5:18.) It would seem as though that ought to settle it that Christians are not to be governed by that law, for surely if we are not under a law, we are under no obligation to obey it."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, pp. 381, 382.

Let it be remembered that this came from Mr. Canright after he had renounced Seventh-day Adventism.

Now let us listen again as Mr. Canright answers himself when he at another time discoursed on the same passage. The following paragraphs, written by him while he was still in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, clearly set forth what the apostle meant by being "under the law," and it is shown that Paul was teaching the very opposite of what was attributed to him by Mr. Canright in his later writings:

"Probably this passage is urged as an objection to the perpetuity of the law oftener than any other. That the law here is the decalogue we all agree. What, then, is meant by the term '*under the law*'? We understand it to mean, to be condemned by the law. Our opponents claim that it means to be under obligation to obey the law; and as Paul says we are not under the law, they claim that we are not now obliged to keep the law. Can it be that we need not keep the commandments against adultery, murder, theft, idolatry, etc.? If their position is correct, this must follow; for these are a part of the law. Paul's entire argument in this book shows that this is not his meaning.

"What subject has he under consideration in this chapter? It is not the difference between the old law and the new, the change from the old dispensation to the new; but the change which takes place in individuals at their conversion, a change from the old man to the new man, from sin to holiness, from condemnation to grace. He first asks, 'How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?' Verse 2. Then he says, 'We are buried with Him [Christ] by baptism.' Verse 4. This shows that he is speaking only of converted men. Next he says, 'Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be de-

stroyed, that *henceforth* we should not serve sin.' Verse 6. That this refers to conversion and not to a change from the old covenant to the new, will be seen by every candid mind. Further on he says, Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Verse 11. Of whom is this true? Only of the converted man. So he is not speaking of all men in general, but only of saints. Again: 'Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.' Verse 12. What is *sin*? John says, 'Sin is the transgression of the law.' 1 John 3:4. Paul then exhorts them not to let their fleshly members and passions lead them to transgress the law. 'For,' said he, 'sin shall not have dominion over you,' Verse 14. Why not? Because the law is abolished? No; but because they have left the service of sin, have ceased to transgress the law of God. His whole argument shows that this is what he means. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.' Verse 14. That is, having broken off your sins, ceased to break the law, believed in Christ, and been baptized, you are now no longer ruled over by sin, nor condemned by the law, because you have found grace in the sight of God, and your sins are pardoned. Then he asks, in the next verse, 'What then? shall we sin [that is, transgress the law, for remember, "sin is the transgression of the law"]', because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.'

"This conclusion of Paul's utterly demolishes the theory of our opponents. For if 'not under the law' means that we are not to obey the law, then it follows that we could transgress it at will. But this, Paul vetoes with a 'God forbid.'

"Take two more places where Paul uses the term 'under the law' as meaning, to be condemned by the law. Thus he says, in Galatians 5:16-18: 'This I say, then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh; for the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.' Now, in this case, who are not under the law? *Those who are led of the Spirit, and those only.* And who are those who are led of the Spirit? Those who do not fulfill the lusts of the flesh—that is, do not commit sin. No other meaning can be given to this text. Then those who are not under the law are converted men, whose sins are pardoned, who have received the Spirit of God, and hence do not transgress His law any more. The text has not the slightest reference to the abolition of the law. Paul says that those who *are led* of the Spirit are *not* under the law. Then it follows that those who are *not led* by the Spirit *are* under the law. This conclusion is so plain that no candid man will deny it. But are the wicked led by the Spirit? No. Then they are under the law. But

if the law has been abolished, then no one can now be under it, no more the wicked than the righteous. This shows that the law does still exist, and is able to hold men under its power.

"Now look a moment at the absurdity of our opponents' position. They say that by the term 'not under the law,' Paul means that the law is abolished, and hence we need not obey it. If this be true, then no one is under the law, whether he is led by the Spirit or not. But Paul declares that in order not to be under the law, we must be led by the Spirit. How plainly this contradicts their conclusion.

"Take one more case. In Romans 3:9-19, Paul says, 'We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one.' And so he goes on in several verses to prove that all are sinners. Then he concludes thus: 'Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.' Verse 19. Now, what is the consequence of being under the law? Paul says it is 'that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.' So that to be under the law is to have our mouths stopped, and to stand guilty and condemned before God.

"No better proof could be given that the meaning which Paul designs to convey is, that the phrase, 'not under the law, but under grace,' means simply not under the condemnation of the law, because not sinners, but in the freedom of the gospel, through the forgiveness of our sins."—*"The Two Laws," pp. 32-36 (old edition, pp. 30-33).*

Christians generally believe that they should not swear, kill, steal, nor lie; in other words, that they should keep the commandments. Seventh-day Adventists believe the same, with this difference, that they apply the same principle also to the fourth commandment. Now, if we are under the law because we believe in keeping all the ten commandments, then the other Christians are nine tenths under the law by keeping nine of them. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

CHRIST TO JUDGE CHRISTIANS, THEREFORE HE SHOULD GIVE THEM THEIR LAWS

From Mr. Canright's renunciation of Adventism we quote two lines as follows:

"Jesus gave commandments to His disciples. . . . We are to

keep His commandments.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*,” p. 361.

Now it is true that Christ did give commandments to His disciples, but the inference here is that they were given to supplant or supersede the decalogue. But such a deduction cannot be substantiated. Every command given by Christ while among men was in perfect harmony with the precepts of the moral law given from Sinai. He came to magnify the law, and make it honorable.

Mr. Canright further says:

“As Christ, . . . the head of the church, . . . is to judge the world (John 5:22) at His judgment seat (Rom. 14:10), how reasonable that He should give the laws to that church.”—*Id.*, p. 365.

This is all very well, but we inquire, Will not Christ also judge the Jew? Or is it the plan that the Father and the Son shall divide the work, one judging the Jews and the other the Gentiles? Will the Jews have to face one standard, the decalogue; and the Gentiles another, the so-called new law of Christ? If so, will we then afterward go to the same heaven? How is this? Does God have two standards of citizenship for His kingdom? Must the Jew attain to one standard of morality and I to another? Can I get through easier than he? Will these two different standards be maintained in heaven, the Jewish community living according to one rule and the Christians another? Or will the Jew perhaps have to undergo training in heaven and familiarize himself with a new moral standard—one that looks just like the old one he used to know, but which has the Sabbath dropped out and the Sunday of the pagan world and papal church substituted?

Surely these things are absurdities. God has one moral standard for all time and all men. Changing ages, priesthoods, and dispensations have not affected one jot or tittle of the great moral code handed down from heaven. And, dear reader, when you and I appear before the judgment seat of Christ alongside our Jewish brethren of past ages, we will all stand on the same

footing, and one standard—the ten commandment law of God—will be applied to our lives, and the same Judge will judge us all. “Is He the God of the Jews only? is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.” Rom. 3:29.

CHRIST IS THE END OF THE LAW

Mr. Canright, in his book, uses as another proof text to show that the moral law ended at the cross, Paul’s statement in Romans 10:4, that “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” He sums up his argument on this point by declaring, “That ends the decalogue.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*,” p. 334. But Mr. Canright, while still a Seventh-day Adventist, clearly answered his own argument on this text as follows:

“We agree that this means the decalogue, but we do not agree that it means that Christ has put an end to that law. End does not always mean termination. It is very frequently used as meaning the object of a thing, as in James 5:11: ‘Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord.’ This certainly does not mean that the Lord died in the days of Job. James means to say, Ye have seen the object of the Lord in the afflictions He brought on Job. The word ‘end’ is used in that sense in the text. Christ is the object of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.”—“*The Two Laws*,” by D. M. Canright, pp. 43, 44.

That is to say: What the law demands of me, Christ *is*. The law finds complete expression in His life. He came to fulfill, or to live out, its every requirement. The moral standard demanded by the law and that revealed in Christ are the same. Therefore the purpose, or end, of the law is that I should be like Christ; and it is evident that this standard can be reached only through faith and obedience.

THE LAW DEAD

When Mr. Canright renounced Adventism, he boldly declared that the law of God was dead. His argument for this is based upon the following statement by the apostle Paul:

"Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Rom. 7:1-4.

Now let us note Mr. Canright's comments upon these verses:

"No statement could be plainer: we are delivered from *the law which is dead*."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 388.

"The apostles say that *the law is dead*."—*Id.*, p. 390.

But the text does not "say that the law is dead." Mr. Canright finds it necessary to misrepresent the meaning of the text in order to read his no-law theory into it.

That Mr. Canright himself well understood the fallacy of this argument that the law is dead, is evidenced by a former extended statement published by him concerning the true meaning of this text. Let us note how, in his earlier statements he completely shatters his own later arguments:

"The position of our opponents on this chapter is, that Paul is showing the contrast between the old dispensation and the new—between the law and the gospel. We believe that Paul has no reference whatever to any such thing, but continues the same subject that he considered in the sixth chapter; namely, the change which takes place in every individual at his conversion from sin to holiness. He first shows how the law condemns the sinner, and yet is just and holy in so doing; and then, how the sinner obtains pardon and grace through faith in Christ, and thereby receives strength to keep the law which he previously found himself unable to obey. Thus we read: 'Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?' Verse 1. He then illustrates what he means by this statement: 'For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.' Verse 2.

"Consider the illustration. Today a woman in Iowa marries

Mr. Smith. Now the law of Iowa binds her to Mr. Smith as long as he lives. There are three things in the illustration: 1. The woman; 2. The husband; 3. The law. Paul says, 'If the husband be dead, she is *loosed* from the law of her husband.' Observe, she is *loosed* from that law. But what is it that died in this illustration? Is it the law? Suppose that Mr. Smith dies, just as Paul says, does that abolish the law of Iowa which bound her to Mr. Smith? How absurd that would be! No; the law does not die, and yet the death of Mr. Smith does loose the woman from that law; not because the law is dead, but because the person is dead to whom it bound the woman. Paul proceeds: 'So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress.' Certainly, if while Mr. Smith lives she should marry Mr. Jones, she would be an adulteress; for the law does not allow her to have two husbands at the same time. Paul goes on: 'But if her husband be dead, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.' Yes; if Mr. Smith dies, then she is freed from the law of Iowa, and can now marry Mr. Jones lawfully. Bear it in mind that Paul twice says that if her husband dies she is loosed from the law, freed from the law. But the same law which bound her to Mr. Smith now binds her to Mr. Jones. It will be seen that in all this illustration there is not the slightest reference to the death or abolition of the law; the law remains the same all the time. It is the husband that dies, not the law. Now, did Paul know how to properly use an illustration or not? We think he did. . . .

"If this illustration is a proper one, it is a very unfortunate one for the no-law position; for in the illustration, the law never died at all, while he declares that by the death of the husband the woman is freed, loosed from the law, and yet the law lives. Now the only question is, What is represented in the illustration by the two husbands? We answer that the old man, the carnal mind, the body of sin, the unconverted man, is represented by the first husband, and the Lord Jesus Christ by the second husband. The following language of Paul settles this point: 'Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.' Verse 4.

"Paul plainly says, 'My brethren, ye are become dead'—not that the law is dead; that it was these brethren who died. Then with whom is the second marriage made? This he as plainly states: They should be married to Him who is raised from the dead. In other words, while the old, carnal man lived, the law of God bound them down in condemnation to that old body of sin; but when that was dead, then they were united to Christ. The next verse confirms the fact that Paul is speaking here of their conversion from sin to righteousness. 'For when we were in the flesh, the motions

of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.' Verse 5. 'When we were in the flesh,' plainly means when we were unconverted, and has no reference to being under some former dispensation. He continues: 'But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held.' Verse 6. The margin says, 'Being dead to that' wherein we were held. The American Bible Union translation says, 'Having died to that wherein we were held;' that is, the old man having died which kept us from being united to Christ, we are delivered from the law just as in our illustration the woman was delivered from the law of Iowa when Mr. Smith died. That it was not the law, but the old man, that died, is put beyond controversy by the following language: 'For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.' Verses 9-11. Here Paul says, 'I died;' the law 'slew me.' Now, did the law die, or did Paul die? He says emphatically the law slew him. Then it was not the law that died, but the old man.

"Then hear his conclusion. If the position of our opponents is true, Paul should have concluded like this: Wherefore the law is dead and abolished, it being a yoke of bondage. But instead of such a conclusion he sums it up thus: 'Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.' Verse 12." —*"The Two Laws,"* by D. M. Canright, pp. 36-39.

This statement was made by Mr. Canright in 1886, just three years before he published his "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," in which he so emphatically declares that "the law is dead." How one could so quickly and so completely reverse himself on so vital a point of Christian doctrine, we cannot understand. We feel sure that the candid reader will agree with us that in this reversal Mr. Canright was certainly not advancing from darkness into light, but was rather retreating from light into darkness. He had departed from the plain and very evident interpretation of Scriptural teaching, and had espoused a theory which cannot possibly be maintained, since it has no foundation in Scripture.

In fact, all teaching that tends to lessen reverence for and confidence in God's great moral standard, the moral law, is altogether subversive of truth, contrary to Scripture, and harks

back to the rebellion of Lucifer in heaven, and his later efforts in Eden when he succeeded in persuading our first parents that the commands of God could be disobeyed with impunity and even profit. For six thousand years Satan has been seeking to break down the restraints which God has placed upon His people through the giving of the decalogue, and the present almost universal reign of lawlessness serves as evidence of how well he has succeeded. Infidels, agnostics, skeptics, and scoffers have joined in sowing the seeds of rebellion and lawlessness, and today the world is reaping the whirlwind. What then may be expected when even the ministry join forces with them, and begin to teach that Christians are under no obligation whatsoever to keep God's great moral code, urging that it has been thrown into discard by the ushering in of the gospel dispensation? Will not Satan thus greatly exult over us, and will not the kingdom of God thus suffer loss?

CHAPTER IV

THE TWO LAWS

THERE are set forth in the Bible two very distinct and separate codes of laws. One of these was given by God directly to His people as He spoke it from Sinai and as He wrote it upon tables of stone with His own finger. The other was given through Moses. The first constituted the standard of morals, while the second dealt primarily with ceremonies connected with the service of God. The transgression of the moral law, or ten commandments, was sin. The second law, dealing with ceremonies, was given only because of the transgression of the first. The first was eternal, while the second was temporary in its application, extending only to the cross.

This great fundamental truth of the gospel which has been almost universally accepted by the Protestant world, is fiercely attacked by Mr. Canright, as will be seen from the following quotations from his book:

"There was no such thing as two separate laws given to the Jews."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 308.

"'Moral law,' 'ceremonial law.' Adventists use these two terms as freely as though the Bible was full of them. . . . If there were two distinct laws given to Israel, so opposite in their nature, it is strange that there is no record of it, no reference to it in the Bible."—*Id.*, p. 309.

"If the reader will bear in mind once for all that 'the law' is the whole Mosaic code, he will easily dispose of all their proof texts."—*Id.*, p. 372.

"The law was given only to the Jews."—*Id.*, p. 320.

"The whole Mosaic system ended at the cross. Surely this is so plainly taught all through the New Testament that no one should deny it. But we have clearly proved that 'the law' included the whole code of laws given to Israel at Sinai, moral, civil, and ceremonial precepts, decalogue and all. . . . That ends the decalogue."—*Id.*, p. 334.

MR. CANRIGHT'S REPLY TO HIS OWN ARGUMENT

Now we will again permit Mr. Canright to reply to his own arguments. While he was still an advocate of the binding claims of the ten commandments, he wrote an excellent treatise on this subject, from which we take the following paragraphs:

"The agitation of the Sabbath question is perceptibly changing the position of ministers and churches touching the decalogue. Till this question came to be urged upon their attention, the so-called orthodox churches were almost unanimously agreed in teaching the binding force of all the ten commandments in the New Testament. They solemnly affirmed this in their creeds, disciplines, and confessions of faith; they strongly defended it in their sermons and writings; and their children were taught it in their catechisms and Sunday schools.

"But if the ten commandments are unrepealed, then the seventh day is the Sabbath and should be observed. Hence, wherever the Sabbath question is agitated we find representatives of the same orthodox churches, in order to avoid that conclusion, quite largely giving up the old positions upon the perpetuity of the decalogue, and advocating the abrogation of all the ten commandments!

"The entire strength of the opposition consists in jumbling together the ceremonial and moral laws, and then affirming that they are all abolished altogether. Plainly settle the distinction between the two laws, and the controversy is ended. The author confidently believes that this is done in the following pages."—*Preface to "The Two Laws," by D. M. Canright, Battle Creek, Michigan, Edition of 1886, three years before he printed "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced."*

Now let us read on. Mr. Canright is still speaking:

"Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

"Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. 2:15.

"Both these texts are in the New Testament, and both were written by the same apostle; yet one asserts that the law has not been abolished by Christ, and the other declares as positively that the law has been abolished. How is this seeming contradiction to be reconciled?—By the simple fact that Paul is speaking of two entirely different laws. The first text relates to the decalogue; the second, to the typical law. . . .

"We will now show that there were two systems of law running parallel from the fall of Adam to the death of Christ; and that then one expired, while the other was confirmed and established.

"In the beginning, man was placed upon probation under such conditions that he could have secured eternal life by simple obedience to God. Adam was placed in Eden and given free access to the tree of life and all the trees, except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Gen. 2:8-17. As long as he could continue to eat of the tree of life, just so long he would live. Gen. 3:22. To Adam the Lord said, 'Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' Gen. 2:16, 17. Then the day of his death would not come till the day when he disobeyed God and ate of the forbidden fruit. Had he never disobeyed God, he never would have died. But death came in consequence of sin, as Paul says, 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.' Rom. 5:12. . . .

"Now, [our first parents] having disobeyed God and become sinners, it thereby became necessary that Christ should die to save fallen men. Hence the Redeemer was immediately promised, in the declaration that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. Gen. 3:15. And so it is said that Jesus was a Lamb 'slain from the foundation of the world.' Rev. 13:8. But it was to be many ages before the Saviour would come; hence it became necessary to offer sacrifices as types and shadows of the death of Christ, thereby to show their faith in the coming Redeemer; also to confess thereby that they were condemned sinners. To offer a sacrifice, they must have an altar upon which to offer it; they must have a priest properly set apart to officiate at the altar; this priest must be supported; and finally a temple with all its ceremonies became necessary. To regulate all these a law was necessary. Hence the introduction of the law relating to types and shadows, commonly called the ceremonial law.

"The least reflection will show that this law never would have existed if man had not previously transgressed the other—the moral law. No precept relating to sacrifices, types, shadows, the priesthood, and the temple, would ever have been given if man had not first broken the moral law, and thus become a condemned sinner, needing a Saviour. . . .

"Many references to both these laws may be seen in Genesis. In chapter 3:21 we learn that the Lord clothed Adam and Eve with skins. This intimates that beasts had been slain in sacrifice. Abel offered a sacrifice of the firstlings of his flock. Gen. 4:4. He did this by faith, as Paul tells us in Hebrews 11:4. By this he showed his faith in the death of the Lamb of God who was to come. But the infidel Cain, having no faith in the coming of Christ, simply brought of the fruit of the ground a thank offering. Gen. 4:3. This the Lord would not accept, as it showed no faith in the coming Redeemer.

“Noah built an altar and offered upon it burnt offerings. Gen. 8:20. So did Abraham. Gen. 12:7, 8. Melchizedek ‘was the priest of the most high God’ (Gen. 14:18), whom Abraham honored and to whom he paid tithes. Verse 20. This shows that at an early day the Lord had regularly ordained priests, and a law for their proper maintenance. Isaac offered sacrifices (Gen. 26:25); so did Jacob (Gen. 31:54).”—“*The Two Laws*,” by D. M. Canright, edition of 1886, pp. 5-11.

HOW THE MORAL LAW WAS GIVEN

After thus showing the distinction between the nature of the moral and ceremonial laws, Mr. Canright proceeds to show how the moral law contained in the ten commandments was given at Mt. Sinai. He pictures the solemnity and significance of this event in the following words (remember that we are still quoting Mr. Canright in reply to himself):

“Notice in what a solemn and impressive manner the moral law was given. After the people had for three days made special preparations to meet with the Lord, He came down in great majesty upon Mt. Sinai. ‘And it came to pass on the third day in the morning that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that were in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And Mt. Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.’ Ex. 19:16-18. Paul says that the Lord’s voice then shook the earth. Heb. 12:26. Moses says, ‘And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and He wrote them upon two tables of stone.’ Deut. 4:12, 13.

“Some have denied that the decalogue is ever called a law; but in this they contradict the plainest teachings of the Bible. Thus the Lord said to Moses, ‘Come up to Me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee *tables of stone*, and a *law*, and *commandments* which I have written, that thou mayest teach them.’ Ex. 24:12. What did God write? The ten commandments; nothing more nor less. That which the Lord wrote on tables of stone is here directly declared to be a law. So in Deuteronomy 33:2, speaking of the descent of the Lord upon Mt. Sinai, Moses says,

'From His right hand went a fiery law for them.' What went from God's right hand? The decalogue; and this is here again called *a law*. Moses is particular to mention the fact that when the Lord had spoken just the ten commandments, '*He added no more; and He wrote them in two tables of stone.*' Deut. 5:22. This indicates that it was a complete law. And when Moses had broken the first tables, the Lord wrote just the same ten commandments the second time. Deut. 10:1-5. This shows that the Lord had a design in selecting those commandments above any others. All through the Bible the decalogue is referred to and quoted as 'the law.'—*Id.*, pp. 11-13.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO LAWS

Mr. Canright knew there was a marked distinction between the two laws, as is evidenced by the following statements published by him before he renounced Seventh-day Adventism:

"Evidently the Lord designed to mark a plain distinction between the two laws in the manner in which He gave them to the people. As we have seen, the decalogue was given in the following manner: 1. God Himself spoke it from heaven with His own voice. Ex. 19:16-19; Deut. 4:12, 13. 2. He wrote it twice with His own finger. Ex. 31:18; 32:16; Deut. 10:1-5. 3. He engraved it upon stone. Ex. 32:16. 4. It was placed in the ark under the cherubim in the most holy place. Ex. 25:16, 22; Deut. 10:1-5.

"Now notice how differently the other law was given:

"1. Moses went up into the mount alone, where, being instructed by an angel, he wrote it out with his own hand. (See Ex. 24:15-18; Deut. 31:9, 24.) And so Paul says, 'It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.' Gal. 3:19. Hence also it is called 'the handwriting of ordinances.' Col. 2:14. For the same reason it is often called 'the law of Moses' (Acts 15:5), not because Moses was the author of the law, but because the Lord gave it through Moses. The Lord was the real author of the law, but Moses was the medium through whom it was made known to the people. Hence it is sometimes called 'the law of the Lord,' and sometimes 'the law of Moses.' (See Luke 2:22, 23, where both terms are used.) But mark this fact: *The ten commandments are never in a single instance called the law of Moses.* [Italics his.]

"2. Moses wrote the ceremonial law in a book of parchment. Deut. 31:24.

"3. Moses spoke this law to the people. Deut. 1:3-5; 31:1; 32:45, 46. 'And Moses made an end of speaking all these words to all Israel. And he said unto them, Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day, which ye shall com-

mand your children to observe to do, all the words of this law.' Deut. 32:45, 46.

"4. This book of the law was then put, not *into* the ark, but *by* the side, as Dr. Horne renders it. 'And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant.' Deut. 31:24-26.

"Thus we see there was one law in the ark, and another outside the ark; one law on the tables of stone, another in the book; one law written by God, another by Moses; one law spoken by God, another by Moses; one law relating to moral duties, and another to ceremonial duties. Who will deny the existence of two laws, when the distinction is so plain? And this distinction is everywhere kept up, both in the Old and in the New Testament. Thus, in 2 Kings 21:8, the Lord says, 'Neither will I make the feet of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers; only if they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law that My servant Moses commanded them.' Here the Lord makes a plain distinction between what He Himself had commanded them and what Moses had commanded them. The same fact is distinctly mentioned in Nehemiah 9:13, 14: 'Thou camest down also upon Mt. Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them Thy holy Sabbath.' We know that this refers to the ten commandments, for the Lord did come down upon Sinai and speak them from heaven, while no other law was thus given. Notice the character ascribed to this law. It is called 'right,' 'true,' and 'good.'

"After describing this holy law which God gave, the prophet adds, 'And commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses, Thy servant.' Here we have, first, one set of 'judgments,' 'laws,' 'statutes,' and 'commandments' spoken to them by the voice of God. Then, secondly, another set of 'precepts,' 'statutes,' and 'laws' by the hand of Moses. This makes it certain that there were two laws given to the people. . . .

"In the New Testament we find the same distinction recognized. 'But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses.' Acts 15:5. Circumcision is the question, and the law regulating it is called 'the law of Moses.' But Paul says, 'I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' Rom. 7:7. This law he immediately calls 'the law of God.' Verse 22. Why so plain a distinction in the two laws everywhere recognized by all inspired writers?"—*Id.*, pp. 20-24.

LAW OF MOSES ABOLISHED BY THE CROSS

"We are now prepared to show that the law of Moses, the ceremonial law, relating to the whole typical system of the Old Testament, such as the priesthood, the sacrifices, circumcision, etc., etc., together with those civil precepts which God granted on account of their blindness and hardness of heart, of which we have spoken before, was abolished at the cross, and that these were the only laws there abrogated. Every passage which speaks of a law being done away refers to these, *never to the ten commandments or any moral precept* or teaching of the Old Testament. The whole typical system pointed directly to Christ. Col. 2:14-17. When He came, in the very nature of things, it must cease. But why should any moral precept be done away there? There is neither reason nor Scripture for such a position."—*Id.*, pp. 25, 26.

"We ask, What is there in the moral law that would indicate that it terminated at the coming of Christ? That law forbids idolatry, profanity, Sabbath breaking, disobedience to parents, murder, theft, etc. Did man's relation to these moral duties change at the coming of Christ? Did the death of Christ alter any of these principles? Most certainly not."—*Id.*, p. 64.

THE TWO LAWS CONTRASTED BY D. M. CANRIGHT
BEFORE RENOUNCING SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

In Mr. Canright's pamphlet on "The Two Laws" published in 1886, only three years before the publication of his "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," he clearly sets forth in the following table the distinction between the moral law contained in the ten commandments and the ceremonial law pertaining to ordinances and ceremonies of the Old Testament sacrificial system. Concerning this table he makes the following explanatory statement by way of preface:

"That the reader may appreciate more forcibly the contrast between the two laws, I have drawn up the following table of comparison between what is said of the great moral law of God as summarily contained in the ten commandments, but including their various branches, the moral precepts of the Old Testament, as well as of the New, and what is said of the law of types as given through Moses. The moral law we will call Number 1, and the ceremonial law Number 2.

- "Number 1. Existed in Eden before the fall.
 "Number 2. Was given after the fall.
- "No. 1. Was violated in the transgression which caused the fall. Gen. 3:6.
 "No. 2. Was given in consequence of that transgression of No. 1. Gal. 3:19.
- "No. 1. Relates only to moral duties. Ex. 20:1-17, etc.
 "No. 2. Is wholly ceremonial, pointing to the promised Seed. Heb. 9:10.
- "No. 1. Was spoken by God from heaven. Deut. 4:12.
 "No. 2. Spoken by Moses. Deut. 1:1-6.
- "No. 1. Was written by God. Ex. 31:18.
 "No. 2. Was written by Moses. Deut. 31:9.
- "No. 1. Was engraved upon stone. Deut. 4:13.
 "No. 2. Was written in a book. Deut. 31:24. . . .
- "No. 1. Christ said, 'Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.' Matt. 5:19.
 "No. 2. The apostles said, 'We gave no such commandment' that 'ye should keep the law.' Acts 15:24. . . .
- "No. 1. Contains the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13.
 "No. 2. 'Stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances.' Heb. 9:10. . . .
- "No. 1. Was 'the royal law.' James 2:8.
 "No. 2. Was the law of Moses. Acts 15:5. . . .

"This list might be greatly extended, but the above points of contrast are sufficient to show that all inspired writers have recognized and noted the distinction between the two laws, the moral and ceremonial."—*Id.*, pp. 97-101.

PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS

Now here is a bewildering situation. In 1889 Mr. Canright, in his book in which he renounces Adventism, boldly states that "there was no such thing as two separate laws given to the Jews." And he adds, "If there were two distinct laws given to Israel, so opposite in their nature, it is strange that there is no record of it, no reference to it in the Bible."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," pp. 308, 309. But just three years before, in 1886, he had published the above table, listing many definite points of distinction between these two laws, and citing numerous Scripture references as proof that such distinction exists. He said, "This list might be greatly extended," thus recognizing the fact that the Scriptures contain many more such evidences of the existence of two distinct codes of laws, and added that "all inspired writers have recognized and noted the distinction between the two laws."

Three years later he declares it impossible to find any such record of the existence of two distinct laws in the Bible! In 1886 he finds many references to it; in 1889 these references have all disappeared. In 1886 he recognizes many definite points of distinction; in 1889 there is no difference. There is only one law.

We frankly admit that we cannot understand the process of a man's mind when he can thus turn away from clear Scriptural evidence and renounce what he admittedly knew to be the teaching of the word of God.

CHAPTER V

WHEN AND TO WHOM WAS THE SABBATH GIVEN?

MR. CANRIGHT bitterly attacks the seventh-day Sabbath, which is kept by the Seventh-day Adventists. He says:

"The Sabbath is not mentioned by name in the book of Genesis, nor till the time of Moses."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 249.

"The Sabbath was given to the Jews."—*Id.*, p. 258.

"'Thou camest down also upon Mt. Sinai, . . . and madest known unto them Thy holy Sabbath.' Neh. 9:13,14. This implies that it was not known before."—*Id.*, p. 255.

Now, these bold statements were made by Mr. Canright after he had repudiated the decalogue and had become an advocate of that no-law doctrine which has brought upon the religious world an era of lawlessness and revolt against God.

While Mr. Canright was still in the Adventist faith, and, like David of old, still delighted in the law of the Lord, he wrote profusely on the subject of the Sabbath as well as upon the law, and it may be of interest to the reader to compare his arguments of that time upon the Sabbath question with those set forth in his book in which he attempts to refute his former teachings. Fortunately these former writings of his are available for reference. We will therefore draw largely from these earlier publications by Mr. Canright, in replying to his later refutation of them, thus permitting the reader to observe how completely his former arguments devour his subsequent denials of them.

In a pamphlet entitled, "The Morality of the Sabbath," written by him in 1875, some fourteen years before he renounced Seventh-day Adventism, Mr. Canright said:

"The principle of every moral precept existed before the fall, and would have existed if man had never fallen. This is true of the Sabbath. But all ceremonial precepts were introduced after the fall, to shadow forth redemption.

"Here again we find that true of the Sabbath which is true of all moral commandments, viz., that it was a primary institution existing before the fall of man. But this is not true of any ceremonial statute. Idolatry, image worship, profanity, lying, stealing, etc., would all have been as morally wrong if committed before the fall as after. Hence, moral duties may be defined as those resting upon primary principles, or those which did exist before man fell, or before any remedial system was instituted. Ceremonial precepts are those which came in consequence of the fall, and which would never have existed but for sin. They grew out of the creature's action as a sinner, and shadowed forth his coming redemption. This is a plainly marked and undeniable distinction between moral and ceremonial precepts. Now we only have to ask to which of these two classes the Sabbath belongs, in order to determine whether it is a moral or a ceremonial precept.

"Only one answer can be given to this. Every fact and principle upon which the Sabbath ever was based did exist before Adam sinned. Creation's work was ended, and the Lord's rest upon the seventh day was in the past. God had placed His blessing upon the seventh day and had set it apart to a sacred use. Thus the record reads: 'Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made.' Gen. 2:1-3.

"This is a plain, chronological narration of what occurred in Eden. God worked six days, rested the seventh day, blessed it, and then sanctified it. 'Sanctify' is thus defined by Webster: 'To separate, set apart, or appoint, to a holy or religious use.' Then the Lord did set apart to a holy use the seventh day in Eden. Every reference afterward to the origin of the Sabbath points back to Eden. (See Ex. 16:23; 20:8-11; 31:17; Mark 2:27.) The Sabbath is a memorial of creation, . . . and hence became necessary as soon as creation week was ended. But for what were types, and shadows, and ceremonies? To point to redemption through Christ who was to come. Col. 2:17; Heb. 10:1. But these were not given until man needed redemption; and he did not need redemption till after he had sinned. But the Sabbath was given before man sinned, and hence was not a typical or ceremonial institution. So we find that the Sabbath is a primary institution, all the reasons for which, like those for every moral precept, existed be-

fore the fall."—*"The Morality of the Sabbath,"* by D. M. Canright, 1875, pp. 9-11.

"The Sabbath precept, like all moral precepts, applies equally well to all nations, in all countries, and at all times.

"All moral laws are of universal application. They are not restricted to one nation or to one country, nor do they change with circumstances; but, on the other hand, merely ceremonial precepts are, from their very nature, restricted in their application to certain persons, times, and places. Here, again, we find evidence of the morality of the Sabbath. As we have shown already, God instituted the Sabbath at creation in Eden before the fall. From this fact several important conclusions necessarily follow:

"1. It is not a type. Types were given after the fall to shadow forth redemption; but the Sabbath points back to creation, not forward to redemption. (See Ex. 20:11.)

"2. The fact that the Sabbath was given in the Edenic state indicates that it was designed to be a perpetual institution. Hence we read that when the curse shall be removed from this old earth, and the new earth state shall be brought in, then the Sabbath will still be observed, and that forever. Isa. 66:22, 23.

"3. It is not a Jewish Sabbath. The simple fact that it was given at creation, twenty-three hundred years before such a distinction existed, proves this.

"4. A Jew is a descendant of Judah, one of the twelve tribes. But Judah himself was not born till nearly twenty-three hundred years after creation. Hence it is absurd to call it a Jewish institution. It is never so called in the Bible, but it is ever designated as God's holy Sabbath.

"The Sabbath was given to Adam, who was the representative head of the whole human race, the father of all men and all nations. Acts 17:26. In giving it to him, God thereby gave it to man as a race; hence Christ says truly, 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Mark 2:27. He does not say it was made for the Jew man, nor for the Gentile man, nor for the Christian man; nor does He limit it in any manner; but He puts it on the broad basis that it was made for man. It is a rule in grammar that a noun unlimited by an adjective is to be taken in its broadest sense, as, 'Man is mortal,' meaning all men, the race. So in this case; Christ does not limit it to one class of men, but says that it was made for 'man,' that is, the race.

"In this language, he points us back to the time when the Sabbath was made, and says that it was made for man. When was the Sabbath made? It was made at creation. God rested on the seventh day, blessed it, and sanctified it. This is how and when it was made. For whom was it made? Christ's language is definite.

It 'was made for man.' Being given to Adam, the father of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, it was thus given to all nations; for Paul says that God 'hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.' Acts 17:26."—*Id.*, pp. 43-45.

Thus in Mr. Canright's former publication he points out very clearly that the Sabbath as well as every moral precept existed in Eden before the fall, that it was instituted at the close of creation week, that it was set apart to a holy and religious use, and that it was given as a memorial of creation, was blessed and sanctified of God, and given to Adam to be kept. He shows that every reference to the Sabbath after that time clearly points back to Eden. He buttresses all these facts by a "Thus saith the Lord" from Scripture. He clearly points out the fact that the Sabbath "is not a type;" that it is "a perpetual institution;" that it "is not Jewish;" that it was made for man, and that in giving it to Adam, who was the representative head of the entire human race, it was thus given through him to all humanity.

Strange that fourteen years later, when Mr. Canright leaves the Seventh-day Adventist Church, he should so completely forget all this evidence of the existence of the Sabbath from the time of creation, and should boldly declare that the Sabbath was not known until Sinai. How, we ask, is it possible for a man who is truly led by the Spirit of God, so evidently to turn away from the clear teachings of the word of God inspired by His Spirit? Does the Spirit thus teach one thing through inspiration and another through Mr. Canright? Is God thus divided against Himself? Or is this additional evidence that Mr. Canright had wandered into the darkness, turning away from the word which David declared to be a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path?

But let us quote further from Mr. Canright's pamphlet, "The Morality of the Sabbath," written before he repudiated the moral law and the Sabbath:

SABBATH COMMAND APPLIES TO ALL AGES

"A careful examination of the commandment will show that it is equally applicable to all nations in all ages. Read it carefully. 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.' 'Cannot Gentiles do that as well as the Jews? Can we not do it as well in America as in Asia?

"'Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work.' Is not that enough for any man to work in any country or in any nation? Can the Gentiles endure to work more days than the Jews? . . .

"'But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.' Is not the seventh day God's rest day now as truly as it was then? Does it not remain a fact now that God did rest upon the seventh day? and as long as this continues to be a fact, will it not be true that the seventh day is God's rest day? Certainly.

"'In it thou shalt not do any work.' We need a day of rest and worship now as much as then, the Gentiles as much as the Jews.

"'Thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.' Do not all these relations exist now among all nations? Do they not all have sons and daughters, servants and cattle? And do not all these need the rest of the Sabbath? Certainly.

"'For in six days the Lord made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.' Is it not just as true now as it was then that God created all things in six days and rested the seventh day? Does not this remain a fact now?

"'Wherefore [that is, for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' Why did the Lord bless the Sabbath day and hallow it? Because that in it He had rested from all His work.

"As we have shown, the Lord set apart the seventh day as a memorial of creation. Who should observe that memorial? All who are interested in creation. Verily, are not the Gentiles as much interested in the work of creation as the Jews ever were? As Paul significantly asks, 'Is He the God of the Jews only? is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.' Rom. 3:29. Was it not, then, true that God created the Gentiles as well as the Jews; and did not the Gentiles inhabit the earth which He there created? Are they not constantly enjoying the blessings which He there made for man? Certainly. Then why should they not be as much interested to commemorate this great work as were the Jews?

"In short, there is not a single idea in the fourth commandment but applies equally well to all nations, in all countries, and at all times. Did the Jews need a day of rest? So do the Gentiles. Did the Jews need a day for religious worship? So do the Gentiles. The Jews kept the seventh day to commemorate creation; so should the Gentiles."—*Id.*, pp. 45-47.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS AGREE

While most of the Protestant world still clings to the custom of Sunday keeping, yet it is a surprising fact that leaders of religious thought in all the great Protestant bodies agree in teaching the eternal perpetuity and the binding obligation of the law of God. And this they do in spite of their continued observance of the first day of the week. Note the following clear declarations from some of them in support of the fact that the seventh-day Sabbath existed from creation, and was not a new institution when given to the Jews at Sinai:

“‘And sanctified it.’ Heb., קִדְּשׁוּ, *kadash*. It is by this term that positive appointment of the Sabbath as a day of rest to man is expressed. God’s sanctifying the day is equivalent to His commandment to men to sanctify it. As at the close of creation the seventh day was thus set apart by the Most High for such purposes, without limitation to age or country, the observance of it is obligatory upon the whole human race, to whom, in the wisdom of Providence, it may be communicated. This further appears from the reason why God blessed and sanctified it, viz., ‘because that in it He had rested,’ etc., which is a reason of equal force at all times and equally applying to all the posterity of Adam; and if it formed a just ground for sanctifying the first day which dawned upon the finished system of the universe, it must be equally so for sanctifying every seventh day to the end of time. The observance of the day is moreover enjoined in the decalogue, which was not abolished with the peculiar polity of the Jews, but remains unalterably binding upon Christians in every age of the world. . . . The sanctification of the seventh day in the present case can only be understood of its being *set apart* to the special worship and service of God.”—“*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis*,” George Bush (Presbyterian), Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, New York City University, Vol. I, pp. 48, 49.

“By this [Sabbath] is meant, 1. the appointed of God at the close of creation, to be observed by man as a day of rest from all secular employment, because that in it God Himself had rested from His work. Gen. 2:1-3. Not that God’s rest was necessitated by fatigue (Isa. 40:28); but He rested, that is, ceased to work, on the seventh day as an example to man; hence assigned it as a reason why men should rest on that day. Ex. 20:11; 31:17. God’s blessing and sanctifying the day, meant that He separated it from a common to a religious use, to be a perpetual memorial or sign that all who thus observed it would show themselves to be the

worshippers of that God who made the world in six days and rested on the seventh. Ex. 20:8-11; 31:16, 17; Isa. 56:6, 7.—“*Theological Compend*,” Amos Binney (Methodist). p. 169.

“When it is therefore said by the inspired historian that God ‘sanctified the seventh day,’ I must understand him to say, that God set it apart (from the other six days of labor), to be religiously employed by man.”—“*The Obligation of the Sabbath*,” Rev. J. Newton Brown (Baptist), p. 48.

“שָׁבַת. [in piel form] to make holy, to sanctify, to hallow. . . . 2. To pronounce holy, to sanctify, e. g., the Sabbath (Gen. 2:3); a people (Lev. 20:8; 21:8). Also to institute any holy thing, to appoint.”—Gesenius, “*Hebrew and English Lexicon*,” Edward Robinson, p. 924.

“Where is the example in Scripture of any instituted commemoration not beginning from the time of its appointment? . . . Did circumcision under the Old Testament, or baptism and the Lord’s supper under the New, remain in abeyance for centuries before they were acted upon? And shall the commemoration of the glories of creation be thought to be suspended for more than two thousand years after the occasion on which it was appointed had taken place? and especially as the reason for the celebration existed from the beginning, related to the whole race of mankind more than to the Jews, and was indeed most cogent immediately after the creation?”—“*The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord’s Day*,” Daniel Wilson, pp. 46, 47.

MARTIN LUTHER ON THE SABBATH

“God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath. This He has not done with any other creature. For heaven and earth or any other creature has He not sanctified to Himself; but only the seventh day. The significance of this is especially that we should learn from it to understand that the seventh day is particularly suited for and ought to be used for divine worship. For that is called sanctified, which is separated from all other creatures and dedicated to God. To sanctify is to select and separate to holy use or divine worship, an expression often used by Moses, for instance when he speaks of holy vessels.

“It is evident from this text, that even though Adam had stood the test and had remained in his innocence, he would still have kept the seventh day.

“And, even though man by sin has lost the perception of God, yet God has willed that the commandment to keep holy the Sabbath should remain, and has willed that man on the seventh day should practice and inculcate the word and worship of God.”—“*Dr. Martin Luther’s Copious Exposition on Genesis*,” translated according to the German Text in Walch’s Edition by F. W. Bugge, Vol. I, pp. 62, 63.

"From these facts I think we may conclude that the Sabbath was originally given to the whole human race, and that it was observed by the Hebrews previously to the giving of the law; and that, in early ages, this observance was probably universal."—*"Elements of Moral Science," Francis Wayland (Baptist), p. 91.*

"The Sabbath was made for all men, and was designed to be a universal and perpetual blessing. It was not made for any particular class or race of men, but for *man*, the generic man, the whole human family."—*"The Lord's Day," Prize Essay, by A. E. Waffle, p. 163.*

"The use of 'remember,' in connection with the fourth commandment, 'implies that the weekly rest day was not a new institution.' It was observed before Sinai was reached. 'The Sabbath was a recognized institution long before the days of Moses. Traces of its strict observance in the ancestral home of Abraham are disclosed in the Assyrian records unearthed in these later days.' (H. Clay Trumbull.)"—*Henry T. Scholl, D. D., in New York Christian Observer (Presbyterian), Dec. 24, 1913.*

"This was the most ancient institution, God calls them to *remember* it; as if He had said, Do not forget that when I had finished My creation I instituted the Sabbath, and remember why I did so, and for what purposes."—*"A Commentary and Critical Notes," Adam Clarke, Vol. I, p. 402.*

"The seventh day was observed from Abraham's time, nay, from creation. The Jews identified their own history with the institution of the Sabbath day. They loved and venerated it as a patriarchal usage."—*"The Evidences of Christianity, a Debate Between Robert Owen and Alexander Campbell," p. 302.*

In his wonderful volume, "Weighed and Wanting," Dwight L. Moody adds the following ringing testimony on this important subject:

"The Sabbath was binding in Eden, and it has been in force ever since. This fourth commandment begins with the word 'remember,' showing that the Sabbath already existed when God wrote this law on the tables of stone at Sinai. How can men claim that this one commandment has been done away with when they will admit that the other nine are still binding?"

"I believe that the Sabbath question today is a vital one for the whole country. It is the burning question of the present time. If you give up the Sabbath, the church goes; if you give up the church, the home goes; and if the home goes, the nation goes. That is the direction in which we are traveling.

"The church of God is losing its power on account of so many people giving up the Sabbath, and using it to promote selfishness."

CHAPTER VI

HAS THE SABBATH BEEN LOST?

BECOMING desperate in his effort to abolish the Creator's Sabbath, Mr. Canright now turns to the age-worn *lost-time* theory. On this point he says:

"Then how do Sabbatarians know that our Saturday is the exact seventh day from creation down? . . . 'There is no possible means of fixing the day of the original Sabbath.' . . . During the long period before the flood, during the patriarchal age when they had no records; during their slavery in Egypt when even traditional knowledge was largely lost; during the anarchy under the judges, and all down the ages since, are they sure that no mistake has been made, not even of one day? Of course they are not."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," pp. 183, 184.*

This objection to the Bible Sabbath has been so often and so adequately answered in the past that it hardly seems necessary to devote much space to it here, and yet we find that some people are genuinely troubled over it.

There is nothing more sure than that there has been an accurate accounting of the days of the week from creation to the present hour. The week was instituted in Eden before the fall, and its beginning and close were marked by the Sabbath. Since that time God has carefully preserved the weekly cycle, as can be proved beyond all possible doubt. But we must refrain from replying to this point ourselves. Much better is it that Mr. Canright again be answered by his own words. In this way it will be clear to the reader that he was fully aware of the fact that the *lost-time* quibble was not valid, and that he simply used it in an effort to create doubt in the minds of those who had never properly looked into the matter.

In 1873 Mr. Canright published a tract entitled, "The Lost-Time Question," in which he completely explodes all his later

arguments on this point. We will quote at some length from this tract in order that the reader may see how fully and completely he has answered himself and how he leaves himself entirely without excuse for advocating this lost-time theory. The following is taken from this former publication :

“Among the numerous excuses which men raise for not keeping God’s holy Sabbath, that one based upon the argument of ‘lost time’ may be called the ‘last ditch.’ When all other arguments fail, persons fall back upon this, and excuse themselves from any further trouble about the matter. We often hear them say that they are convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that they would keep it, if they only knew which it was; but that, either before the flood or during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, or in the Babylonish captivity, or during the Dark Ages, or somewhere, time was so lost that the true seventh day cannot be found. That this *excuse* is utterly without foundation we are sure we can now convince the reader, if he is candid enough to really desire the *truth* in the case.

That Saturday is the true and veritable seventh day, the day upon which God rested at the creation of the world, can be proved by an overwhelming mass of evidence. Is it not a little strange that until seventh-day advocates came along no one ever said anything about time being lost, and that you could not tell when the seventh day comes? From the minister in the desk to the child in Sunday school, all agreed that Saturday was the old seventh day upon which God rested, and Sunday the first day on which Christ rose from the dead. But when it is shown that there is no proof for a first-day Sabbath, and that the Scriptures teach that the seventh day is still the Sabbath, then, behold, these same persons are very ignorant all at once. Time has been lost, and they cannot tell when the seventh day comes. Can they tell when the first day comes, the day of Christ’s resurrection? They never seem to have any doubt about this. If they can tell that, certainly we can find the seventh day; for it must be the one just before it! Having found the first day, any person who can count seven on his fingers ought to be able to find the seventh day! Somehow, notwithstanding all the other days of the week are so easy to find and to count, this seventh day is very slippery, bothersome, and hard to find. It reminds me of the boy who was sent out by his father to count the pigs. He returned, saying that there were six pigs besides one little spotted fellow that frisked about so that he could not count him!

“We should naturally suppose that this cry of ‘lost time’ would be confined to those who claim that there is no Sabbath now binding; but this is not the case. They generally freely acknowledge

that Saturday is the old and true seventh day, and that there is no reliance to be placed upon the argument of lost time. Surprising indeed it is to hear this argument used by those who profess a great regard for the Sabbath commandment, and for Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, the resurrection day. They seem not to realize that if time has been lost, they are as bad off as we are. This objection weighs just as heavily against the first day of the week as it does against the seventh.

“Allowing that the seventh-day Sabbath is binding, it is unreasonable to suppose that God has suffered it to be lost. If God has given a law requiring the observance of the seventh day, He certainly is able to preserve the knowledge of that day if He still desires men to keep it. It is, then, highly absurd to admit that the seventh day is the day that ought to be kept, and then to say that we would keep it if we could only tell which it is, claiming that it has been lost! It is directly impeaching the wisdom and power of God. Equally unreasonable is it to claim that any other day of the week is the Sabbath, and yet to say that the days of the week have been lost so that you cannot tell when it does come. No; the judgment day will show that all these objections and quibbles arise more from a carnal heart unwilling to submit itself to the plain requirements of the law of God than they do from any real difficulty in the case.

SATURDAY THE TRUE SEVENTH DAY

“But to the facts in the case. Follow us carefully, and see if there is not an abundance of proof that Saturday is the true seventh day from creation. Genesis 1 gives a concise history of the first six days of time. Chapter 2:1-3 says: ‘Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God *blessed* the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made.’

“Here we have a sure starting point. God worked the first six days. He rested the seventh. Then He blessed the seventh day. After that He sanctified it. To sanctify is to set apart, to appoint to a holy use. (See Webster.) This shows that God there appointed this day for Adam and his family to keep holy. By thus keeping it, it would weekly mark off a period of seven days. Hence originated a week of seven days, which we find so often mentioned in the history of the patriarchs, and afterward of the Jews. Notice a few instances. Just before the flood, God said to Noah, ‘For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth.’ Gen. 7:4. Of Noah it is said: ‘And he stayed yet other seven days; and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark.’ Gen. 8:10. And

again, 'And he stayed yet other seven days, and sent forth the dove.' Verse 12. Laban said to Jacob: 'Fulfill her week, and we will give thee this also for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet other seven years. And Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week.' Gen. 29:27, 28. These quotations . . . show that the week, composed of seven days, was known and observed by the patriarchs both before and after the flood. Hence, it is strong proof that they had the Sabbath and observed it. Of the antiquity of the week and the Sabbath among all nations, Gilfillan, in his large book on 'The Sabbath,' published by the American Tract Society, says:

"Let it suffice, however, in a matter on which there is so general an agreement, to present the words of four eminent authors: "The septenary arrangement of the days," says Scaliger, "was in use among the Orientals from the remotest antiquity." "We have reason to believe," observes President DeGoguet, "that the institution of that short period of seven days, called a *week*, was the first step taken by mankind in dividing and measuring their time. We find, from time immemorial, the use of this period among all nations, without any variation in the form of it. The Israelites, Assyrians, Egyptians, Indians, Arabians, and, in a word, all the nations of the East, have in all ages made use of a week, consisting of seven days. We find the same custom among the ancient Romans, Gauls, Britons, Germans, the nations of the North, and of America." According to Laplace, "the week is perhaps the most ancient and incontestable monument of human knowledge." It would appear that the Chinese, who have now no Sabbath, at one time honored the seventh day of the week.—Pages 364, 365.

"All these ancient nations, being descendants of Noah and his sons, must have received the Sabbath by tradition from them. That the Sabbath would not be lost from Adam to Abraham is manifest when we consider that Adam lived and conversed with Methuselah for 243 years; Methuselah lived contemporary with Shem about 100 years; and Shem lived and talked with Abraham. . . .

"The lives of these three men span the whole time from Eden even to the old age of Abraham. How easy and natural for them to hand down the Sabbath from father to son without any probability of losing it.

NOT LOST IN EGYPT . . .

"Coming a little further down, was not the Sabbath lost in Egypt? Let us read, in Exodus 16, what occurred immediately on their coming out of Egypt: 'Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them,

whether they will walk in My law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.' 'And they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating; and when the sun waxed hot, it melted. And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man; and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake today, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that today; for today is a Sabbath unto the Lord; today ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep My commandments and My laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day.' 'And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan.' Verses 4, 5, 21-30, 35. . . .

"This was the special work of the Almighty, to teach the Jews to remember, reverence, and keep holy His sanctified Sabbath day. . . . Truly, had all traces of the Sabbath been lost, it was here so forcibly restored that none could doubt when it came. Here it was certainly restored if it was ever lost.

"But was this the true, original seventh day here pointed out? It would be preposterous to claim anything else. 1. God certainly knew when His original, true seventh-day Sabbath came, and was able to point it out. 2. That He should give them another day and teach them by the falling manna, etc., to violate His own holy Sabbath, is highly unreasonable, and not to be supposed unless most distinctly so stated. 3. The record directly says that that day was 'the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord' (verse 23), 'the seventh day which is the Sabbath.' Verse 26. These statements are repeated several times in the above record. 4. Shortly after the manna began to fall on the six days and none on the seventh, while the whole nation was keeping that day as the Sabbath, according to God's direct instructions, the Lord came down upon Mt. Sinai and gave them the ten commandments. The fourth one relates to the Sabbath, and reads thus: 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy

work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' Ex. 20:8-11.

"What does this command require? That they keep 'the Sabbath day,' 'the seventh day,' 'the Sabbath of the Lord,' the day which God had rested upon, and blessed and sanctified at creation, after working six days. In short, it points out and specifies in the most definite manner the very day we started with in Genesis 2:1-3. No candid person can doubt this who will compare the two records. So, then, at the entrance of the Jews into Canaan, 2,553 years after the creation of the world, we are certain that we have the true seventh day.

"In the Promised Land, they became a great and numerous people, a settled and established nation for over 800 years. During all this time, they had the strictest laws and regulations touching the observance of the Sabbath. During this time, God often spoke to them by His prophets, and frequently called their attention to His holy Sabbath. (See 2 Kings 4:23; 1 Chron. 9:32; Isa. 56:2-6; 58:13; Jer. 17:24-27; Eze. 20:10-24; Amos 8:4-6.) Samuel, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and all the noted kings of Israel lived in this time. To suppose that the Sabbath was lost during this time would be simply absurd. It would have been impossible. . . .

PRESERVED DURING THE CAPTIVITY

"Next comes, 600 years before Christ, the Babylonish captivity of seventy years. Was it not lost here? Notice a few facts: 1. God sent them into that captivity because they did not regard His Sabbath strictly enough. Jer. 17:17-24; Neh. 13:15-18. Would He then allow the Sabbath to be lost so that they could not keep it, and thus frustrate the very object for which He sent them there? 2. Daniel, the greatest of all God's prophets, lived in Babylon with the captives during the whole of their sojourn there. (See Dan. 1:1-21; 9:1, 2; Ezra 1:1-6, etc.) Daniel thus having constant communion with God would have corrected his people had they been in danger of losing or forgetting the Sabbath, as he was very jealous for the law of his God. Dan. 6:5. 3. As soon as the Jews return to Jerusalem, they solemnly promise God not to violate His Sabbath any more; and Nehemiah reminds them that this was the very sin for which they were sent into bondage. Neh. 10:31; 13:15-18. 4. It would not be possible for a whole nation in the short space of seventy years to forget and lose the Sabbath, even though they had no prophets to teach them, which, however, the

Jews did have. What would we think of the assertion that the Americans had lost Independence Day within the last hundred years, so that we could not tell when the 4th of July does come? The idea would simply be laughed at. Yet the 4th of July comes only once a year, and hence would be much more easily lost than the Sabbath, which comes once every week, besides being a day much more sacredly observed. 5. The records and genealogies were all carefully kept during this time. 6. On their return, the whole nation is still found keeping the Sabbath, without any disagreement as to which day it was. Neh. 10:31. These facts show that it was not lost then.

"About 500 years before Christ, the Jews returned to Judea, and there remained till the final overthrow of Jerusalem, seventy years after the birth of Christ. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi prophesied during this time.

"Again the Jews became a powerful nation, settled in their own land, under the Maccabees and others. The Sabbath now comes in still more prominently. They regarded it so strictly that some of the time they would not even defend themselves in war on that day. 1 Maccabees 2:32-40. (See Josephus.) Of course there was no possibility of their losing the Sabbath at that time. So when Christ came, He found them all very strict and overparticular in keeping the Sabbath. Matt. 12:1-12; John 5:5-19.

CHRIST AND THE DISCIPLES KEEP THE SABBATH

"Thus we have carefully traced the Sabbath for over 4,000 years, to the coming of Christ. Here, again, we have another sure waymark: Christ, the Son of God, knew all things. If the Sabbath had been lost, He would have known it, and have corrected it. But He gave no intimation that the Jews were not keeping the right day. He kept the same day that they did. He said it was the Sabbath day, and He was its Lord. Mark 2:27, 28. In Luke 23:54-56 and 24:1, we read thus: 'And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with Him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how His body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.'

"Here are several important declarations: 1. We have the preparation day, which was the sixth day. Ex. 16:5. 2. Following this, we have the next day, 'the Sabbath day according to the commandment.' 3. And the next day was 'the first day of the week.' This is the language of Inspiration, hence there is no discount upon it; therefore that day was 'the *first day* of the week.' Hence, we

are still on the right track, and know that we have not lost the days of the week. This fact is made doubly sure by the inspired declaration that the day before the first day of the week was 'the Sabbath day according to the commandment.' Here, again, we know that we have the correct Sabbath day, the one enjoined in the commandment; for Inspiration says so. The Sabbath day 'according to the commandment' could be no other day than the one which that commandment enjoined, which we have shown is none other than the very day upon which God rested. After this, the Sabbath is frequently mentioned in Acts. (See chapters 13:15; 15:21; 16:13; 17:2; 18:3.) The last time it is named is in Revelation 1:10, 96 A. D., which brings us to the close of the Bible and of the first century. Now we have spanned 4,100 years of the world's history, and found no place for the Sabbath to be lost yet.

THE JEWS BEAR UNANSWERABLE TESTIMONY

"But has not time been lost since the year 96 A. D., perhaps during the Dark Ages? Let us see. At the time of Christ, and ever since, the Jews were and have been great sticklers for the Sabbath—very careful in observing it. In 70 A. D., about forty years after the resurrection of Christ, Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, and the Jews were led away captive into all nations, thus fulfilling Luke 21:20-24; Deuteronomy 28:25, 37, 64. Though eighteen hundred years have passed, the Jews are still a scattered nation, and yet a distinct people. In every country, in every clime, in every nation, and in almost every city, today may be found the Jew. During these eighteen long centuries, under every vicissitude, they have still tenaciously clung to the Sabbath. Every person of intelligence knows that the Jews all keep the Sabbath on Saturday. Thus Webster, under the word 'Sabbath,' says: 'The Sabbath of the Jews is on Saturday.' M. A. Berk, in his 'History of the Jews,' page 335, says: 'According to the Jewish computation of time, the day commences at sunset. On Friday evening, and about an hour before sunset on this evening, all business transactions and secular occupations cease, and the twenty-four hours following are devoted to the celebration of the holy Sabbath.'

"Now that they have not lost the Sabbath day, but have kept the days of the week correctly, is easily demonstrated. Scattered as widely apart as they have been all this time, had they lost the correct numbering of the days of the week, they would now be found to disagree among themselves as to which was the true Sabbath day. Some would claim that it was Saturday; others, that it was Monday; still others, that it was Thursday, etc., etc. But there is no such disagreement among them, as every one knows. In Asia and in Europe, in Africa and in America, all agree on the same day, namely, Saturday. Now, any one can readily see that

the Jews, being for eighteen hundred years so widely scattered, even on opposite sides of the globe, could not lose the correct Sabbath, and yet all continue to keep the same day. It would be the very height of absurdity to suppose that all the millions of the Jews so far separated should lose just the same number of days, and at the same time, and in the same direction, that is, by adding to, or dropping out, a day or more.

“Take a simple illustration: Seven men go out into the wilderness, hunting. At a certain point they all separate, each going a different direction. After several weeks, maybe months, they all meet again. Now the question arises, Have they kept the days of the week correctly, or have they lost the Sunday so that they cannot positively tell when it does come? They begin to compare reckonings. A says, Today is Monday. No, says B, today is Thursday. Both wrong, replies C, today is Sunday. And you are mistaken, too, exclaims D, for today is Friday. And thus, to the end, they all differ. This would prove that they certainly had lost the day. No one would question that. But, on the contrary, suppose all unanimously agreed on the day—that it was Monday, for instance. It would be as sure as a mathematical demonstration that none had lost the day.

“So of the Jews. Their unanimous agreement on the day shows that they have kept it correctly. None who are not willingly blind can fail to see this. We shall, then, put down the five millions of Jews now in the world as so many living witnesses that Saturday is the true seventh-day Sabbath. Indeed, I believe, and it is evident, that the leading object of the Lord in scattering the Jews among all nations and yet preserving them a distinct people, was to make them witnesses of the truth of His word, and to preserve the knowledge of His holy Sabbath among all nations. Their strict and continued observance of the Sabbath in all ages and among all nations, forms an insurmountable argument which can never be set aside by those who assert that the Sabbath has been lost. God has preserved a whole nation of witnesses, and sent them into all parts of the world to bear testimony to the existence and correct preservation of the knowledge of His holy Sabbath day.

RABBI WISE CONFIRMS THESE CONCLUSIONS

“In response to an inquiry on this point, addressed to Isaac M. Wise, of Cincinnati, Ohio, probably the most learned Jewish Rabbi in this country, he returned to me the following communication:

“*Rev. D. M. Canright.*

“DEAR SIR:

“There is no century in authentic history not covered by Jewish tradition. Hence, one might just as well argue Sunday is not

the first day of the week or the third after the crucifixion, or the Hebrew Bible is not the literature of the ancient Jews, or any other fact or facts, as to maintain that the Jews forgot the order of the days, when the Sabbath was so holy to them. . . .

"The Jews, having no names of days, called them first, second, etc., to Sabbath. If they had forgotten to count in any one locality where they were dispersed since 800 B. C., some would have done it in another locality, and a dispute among themselves about the right Sabbath must have occurred.'

"With these facts well considered, the reader will agree with the learned rabbi that it is an absurdity to claim that the Sabbath has ever been lost.

ENTIRE WORLD IN AGREEMENT ON DAYS OF WEEK

"Some two or three centuries after Christ, Christians began to regard the first day of the week as a sacred day. In a short time, this practice became almost universal among Christians. Christendom is now divided into three great branches; viz., the Greek Church, numbering 66,000,000, the Catholic Church, numbering 170,000,000, and the Protestant churches, numbering 88,000,000, making a total number of 324,000,000.

"All these have always been, and are now, unanimous in teaching that Sunday is the first day of the week, the resurrection day, and that Saturday is the old, original, seventh-day Sabbath. No one ever thought of disputing this fact till of late, when it is found that there is no proof for first-day sacredness. But here are 324,000,000 witnesses who, by their hymns, their prayers, their sermons, their books, their customs, and all their traditions, teach that Sunday is the first, and Saturday the seventh, day of the week.

"The Mohammedans, and long before them the Saracens, adopted the sixth day for their Sabbath. Numbering 160,000,000, they all still keep Friday. Gilfillan, in 'The Sabbath,' p. 359, says: 'Before Mohammed's time, the Saracens kept their Sabbath on Friday, and from them, he and his followers adopted the custom.' Rev. Robert Morris, who has traveled in Palestine, and written so extensively concerning the Holy Land, also confirms the same fact. (See *The Holy Land* for January, 1871.) Here, again, we have 160,000,000 more witnesses that the days of the week have been correctly kept.

"All the laws of Christendom recognize the fact that Sunday is the first day of the week, and Saturday the seventh. Thus, the Sunday law of Iowa reads: 'If any person be found on the first day of the week, . . . engaged in any riot, fighting,' etc.—'*Statute Law of Iowa, Revision of 1860, chap. 175, art. 2, sec. 1, p. 751.* The venerable old family Bible, in its time-table, teaches the same thing. It reads thus:

“DAYS OF THE WEEK

“1st day of the week	Sunday
“2d day of the week	Monday
“3d day of the week	Tuesday
“4th day of the week	Wednesday
“5th day of the week	Thursday
“6th day of the week	Friday
“7th day of the week, or Sabbath	Saturday

“Turn to your large family Bible, and see if it does not so read. So far, then, as we can rely upon this it corroborates the fact that Saturday is the old Sabbath, the original seventh day. Could we ask a better witness?

“Webster’s great dictionary bears its testimony to the same undoubted fact. Thus: ‘Sunday, *n.* First day of the week.’ ‘Monday, *n.* The second day of the week.’ ‘Saturday, *n.* The last day of the week, . . . the Jewish Sabbath.’ Do all these great authors have no authority for what they say? Have they all conspired to tell a lie?

“Take up a family almanac, and it will teach us the same undoubted and universally acknowledged truth, that Saturday is the original Sabbath day. Look at your almanac and see Sunday marked first day of the week, and Saturday the seventh or last day.

ASTRONOMY BEARS TESTIMONY THAT NO TIME HAS BEEN LOST

“But now the science of astronomy comes in and settles this whole matter beyond the shadow of a doubt. Every one is familiar with the fact that eclipses of the sun or moon can be so exactly calculated as to tell to a minute just when they will occur, long beforehand. Indeed, they can be calculated a thousand years ahead as well as one year. So they can be calculated backward just as easily. Before the Christian era, and all along at different times since, eclipses have occurred and have been recorded. By calculating back, it would soon appear if even one day had been lost, as the recorded eclipse would not have come when it ought to. Such calculations have been made, and no such loss of time appears.

“In answer to a question upon this point which I addressed to a celebrated astronomer, I received the following:

“OGDEN, UTAH, Sept. 24, 1873.

“ELDER D. M. CANRIGHT: Back computations of eclipses of the sun give the year right. Since Ptolemæus (about 500 B. C.) there cannot be one day lost, because his equinoctiums and those com-

posed now back to that time agree. A change or loss of one minute would be found out in this way.

“(Signed) ‘DR. F. KAMPF,
“‘Astronomer of the U. S. Corps of Engineers.’”

“This is good testimony from the highest authority. It shows that we have positive scientific proof that not a day has been lost at least since 500 years before Christ.

“Indeed, when we come to the real matter of fact, it is simply impossible to lose the days of the week, even though we had no almanacs, no records, no histories. Look at the facts in the case. Take our own nation, for example. How could we lose the days of the week? Suppose one family in town should forget and lose the days of the week. Sunday comes and they go to work, plowing, washing, etc. How long would it be before their neighbors would come along and tell them their mistake? Such instances do occur; but seldom does a person get through the day without discovering his error.

“Again, suppose a whole village should make the same mistake at the same time, which of course is impossible, and all lose the day of the week. Sunday they all go to work as usual; stores are opened, shops run, etc. Soon, people from the country come in to meeting and find them all at work. The result would be that they would compare reckonings and count back and see what they had done on each of the last six days. In this way the error would be immediately discovered. And so we might go on with the illustration. If one family loses the day, the whole town is against them, and will correct them; if a whole town makes the mistake, the rest of the country is against them, and would soon correct them. In short, the established rest day in each week coming so often and being kept by all the people, it is absolutely impossible to lose it. No candid person who will look at the facts can believe that the Sabbath day has ever been lost. . . .

“Was not the Sabbath day thrown out of its order, was not a day lost, when Joshua commanded the sun to stand still? No. The record says: ‘The sun stood still in the midst of the heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.’ Joshua 10:12-14. . . . That day was about as long as two ordinary days, but yet it was only *one day*, the sun set only once. The Lord required us to keep only the *seventh day*, not the seventh part of time. The day is to be reckoned from sunset to sunset. Gen. 1:5; Lev. 23:32; Deut. 16:6; Mark 1:32. Hence this was to be counted only one day, and in no manner affects the reckoning of the week. The same principle holds good in the case where the sun turned back ten degrees in the time of Hezekiah. Isa. 38:8. It appears that this day also was longer than usual. Yet it was only one day, as in the case of Joshua.

CHANGE TO THE GREGORIAN CALENDAR

"Was not the Sabbath lost in changing from the Old Style to the New Style of reckoning time? No. It did not affect the Sabbath in the least, one way or the other. But what is Old Style and New Style? Let us see.

"The Julian Calendar, so called, or that which was established by Julius Cæsar, by which every fourth year was made to consist of 366 days, and the other years of 365 days, is called *Old Style*. By this mode of computation, the years were made to average something over *eleven minutes* too much; so that in the course of a few centuries there would be a perceptible disarrangement of the equinoxes; i. e., the sun would actually arrive at an equinoctial point several days, perhaps, before the time indicated by the day of the month on which it should annually recur. It will be seen that if such a mode of computation were to be continued, a complete displacement of the seasons of the year would eventually be wrought. Pope Gregory XIII, 1582 A. D., in order to correct the equinoxes at that time, or bring back the vernal equinox to the same day as at the Council of Nice, 325 A. D., found it necessary to retrench ten days. He accordingly retrenched that number of days in October, 1582 A. D., which was done by simply calling the fifth day of the month the fifteenth.

"This reformation of the Julian Calendar by Pope Gregory was adopted in Great Britain by act of Parliament, 1751 A. D., at which time it was necessary to retrench *eleven days*. Accordingly eleven days were retrenched in the month of September in the following year, simply by reckoning the *third* day as the *fourteenth*. This method (by which every year divisible by four, unless it be divisible by 100 without being divisible by 400, has 366 days, and all other years 365 days) is what is called *New Style*. By reckoning according to this ingenious mode, there can never occur any perceptible disarrangement of the equinoxes, as would continually occur under the former calendar, or *Old Style*. (See Thompson's Higher Arithmetic, p. 157.)

"It may be readily seen that this did not in the least affect the reckoning of the days of the week. October 5 was simply called October 15. Suppose that before the change that day was Friday; what day of the week would it be after the change? Would it not be Friday still? Most certainly. The regular succession of the days of the week and of the Sabbath continues to come just the same, whatever change may be made in the reckoning of the year or month.

"But why talk about *lost time* on that occasion? How was it lost? Do we not know just *when* it occurred? Yes. Do we not know just *how* it happened? Yes. Do we not know just how many days were dropped? Yes. Is there not an authentic record of

the whole thing? Yes. In the name of common sense, then, how was any time lost?

"Suppose I have just one hundred dollars in my pocket. I go into my bedroom, carefully count out ten dollars and put it into the drawer. Then I come out and tell my family that I have lost some money. They ask, When? I say, Today. Where? In the bureau drawer in the bedroom. How much? Just ten dollars. Would they not say I was jesting or insane? Just so about lost time at the change from Old Style to New Style. When was it lost? October 5, 1582. How much was lost? Ten days. Strange loss this! . . .

1582		OCTOBER				1582	
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	
	1	2	3	4	15	16	
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	
31							

Showing the Change From the Julian to the Gregorian Calendar

The change from old style to new style did not interfere in any way with the free-running week. The change was made on Friday, October 5, 1582. Ten days were made up by calling the 5th of October the 15th of October. This is all that was done.

THE EVIDENCE SUMMED UP

"To sum up the evidence: The Sabbath was given to the head of the human family at creation; it was observed by the patriarchs, three of whose lives cover the period from Eden to Abraham's old age, and hence the knowledge of the Sabbath was easily handed from father to son; the Sabbath was again miraculously pointed out by God, in the falling of the manna at the exode; strictly guarded by law and kept by the whole Jewish nation for eight

hundred years; best of evidence is given that it was not lost in Babylon; it was strictly kept for five hundred years till Christ; He gave no intimation of any loss up to His time; taught that it was the correct Sabbath; positive statement is made by Inspiration that the Jews had the days of the week and the old Sabbath day correct at the death of Jesus; often mentioned in the New Testament till 95 A. D.; 5,000,000 Jews today bear witness that it has not been lost; 60,000,000 Greek Christians, 170,000,000 Catholics, and 88,000,000 Protestants all agree that Saturday is the old seventh day; 160,000,000 Mohammedans agree to the same fact; the laws of the land, the old Family Bible, Webster, the almanac, and astronomy, all unanimously agree that no time has been lost, but that Saturday is the old Sabbath day.

"What proof do they bring against all this mass of evidence? None whatever. They want it so. They hope it is so, and hence assert that it is so. Time is lost. Why? Because. How do you know? Because it has been lost. This is the evidence, and the only evidence I ever heard. A man's mere assertion against the evidence of the world!!

"In conclusion, reader, are you weekly violating God's holy Sabbath under the vain plea that you cannot tell when it does come? Is not this a mere excuse adopted to evade the cross? Are you willing to risk your soul upon such a sandy foundation? Are not the preceding evidences overwhelming that Saturday is the original seventh day? Even granting, which, however, we do not believe is the case, that it is not positive proof beyond any doubt, yet you must admit that, so far as there is any evidence, it all goes to show that Saturday is the original Sabbath day. Shall we reject all this mass of testimony and retain a day for which there is not a particle of evidence? Will such a course stand the test of the judgment? In all worldly matters where there is any doubt, we decide in favor of the strongest evidence. Do so in this case, and you will certainly have to decide that Saturday is the old, original Sabbath day."—*"The Lost-Time Question,"* by D. M. Canright, 1873.

Surely the evidence offered here by Mr. Canright as a Seventh-day Adventist, absolutely overthrows the lost-time theory of Mr. Canright as a Baptist. How sad that he should have turned away from this clear evidence of the continuity of the original seventh-day Sabbath in unbroken succession from creation to our day.

CHAPTER VII

THE NATURE OF THE SABBATH COMMANDMENT

ONE of Mr. Canright's strong arguments against the Sabbath commandment is that it is not entirely moral in its nature, but partly ceremonial, and was therefore of temporary obligation only. On this point he says:

"That the Sabbath of the decalogue was partly moral and partly ceremonial, or positive, in its nature has been the doctrine of the church as taught by its best theologians in all ages."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 166.

"Adventists claim that there was nothing ceremonial in the decalogue or about the Sabbath. But let us consider what a ceremony is. Webster says: 'Ceremony. Outward rite, external form in religion.' That is exactly what the observance of the Sabbath was in Jewish worship. . . .

"The observance of the Sabbath on a particular day was a ceremonial service."—*Id.*, p. 171.

Now this further objection is not difficult to answer. In fact, Mr. Canright, in one of his former publications, "The Morality of the Sabbath," written while he was still a Seventh-day Adventist, makes such a comprehensive and convincing reply to this later quibble of his that we will again grant him the privilege of demolishing his own argument.

At that time he wrote:

"When the claims of God's holy Sabbath are presented, and its observance is urged upon the people, then every effort is made by its opponents to belittle it as an institution of small account. It is said that the Sabbath law is only a ceremonial precept, given simply for man's convenience, and that its observance or non-observance is a matter of little importance. While it is admitted that all the other precepts of the decalogue are moral and their observance all-important, it is asserted that the fourth commandment is of a very different nature, containing no test of moral

character. The only importance attached to it is that of a day for physical rest and religious gatherings.

"While the Sabbath is regarded in this light, of course men will not feel very particular about observing it. We propose, therefore, to show that the nature and design of God's Sabbath day is as much higher than this view of it as heaven is higher than the earth; that it is not only a moral institution, but that it is the most important precept in the whole decalogue. In proof that the Sabbath is a moral precept, we offer the following facts:

"Moral duties and precepts are such as grow out of the attributes of God. Creative power is the distinguishing attribute of the living God, and the Sabbath grew directly out of the exercise of this attribute in the creation of the world.

"I do not see how the truthfulness of this proposition can be denied by any one. Why are we morally bound to serve God?—Because He created us and all the blessings which we enjoy. None will deny that this is the basis of all our duties to God. A little reflection will show that it is not so much the wisdom, or the justice, or the holiness, or any other attribute, of the Deity, as it is His act of creating us, which makes it our moral duty to obey Him. Notwithstanding God is infinitely wise, just, holy, etc., could we bring ourselves into existence and sustain ourselves without His aid, we would be under no obligation to serve Him. This is an important fact which we wish the reader to weigh carefully. It is, then, God's attribute of creative power above all others, that is the basis of all our moral duties to Him. He made us by His power as a Creator, and by His power He can destroy us; hence He has a perfect right to say what we shall, or shall not, do. So Paul argues in Romans 9:20-23. Now the very basis of the Sabbath was God's act of creating the world in six days and resting upon the seventh. 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore [for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' Ex. 20:8-11; Gen. 2:1-3.

"The foundation of the Sabbatic precept, then, is the same as that of all other moral precepts; and hence it must be moral.

"The Sabbath, like all other moral precepts, rests upon eternal and unalterable facts.

"In creating the world, God worked the first six days of the first week of time. He then rested upon the seventh day. That act made it His rest day, or Sabbath day. *Sabbath* is a Hebrew word signifying *rest*. Hence, the Sabbath day of the Lord signifies the rest day of the Lord. Therefore, when God had rested upon the seventh day, that day had thus become distinguished from all the other days of the week as God's *rest*, or *Sabbath*, day. When a man is born upon a certain day, that day becomes his *birthday*.

No other day in the year is his birthday. So the day upon which God rested, the seventh day, and no other, is God's Sabbath day.

"These facts of creation are just as true now as they were when the Sabbath was first given, six thousand years ago. Is it not as true now as it was then that God did work the first six days of the week? Certainly. Then these are still only working days, as the Lord has properly named them. 'Thus saith the Lord God, The gate of the inner court that looketh toward the east shall be shut the *six working days*; but on the Sabbath it shall be opened.' Eze. 46:1. Is it not also just as true now as it was then that the seventh day is God's Sabbath day? Is it not still the day upon which He rested, and, hence, His rest day? Can you change your birthday from the day upon which you were born to one upon which you were not born? Of course not. Neither can the Lord's rest day be changed from the day upon which He did rest to one upon which He did not rest. Has the first day of the week become the Sabbath (rest) day of the Lord? Impossible, because no day can become God's rest day till He has first rested upon that day. But God never did rest upon any day except the seventh. Hence, the Sabbath day of the Lord is unchangeably fixed to the seventh day. This will always remain a fixed fact while the earth stands, which will be eternally. For this earth is to be purified and become the everlasting abode of the righteous. Isa. 65:17-25; 2 Peter 3:7-13; Isa. 66:22, 23. So long as days shall continue to succeed each other, so long must the seventh day continue to be the Creator's Sabbath day. And so we read in Isaiah 66:22, 23: 'For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before Me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before Me, saith the Lord.' This evidence proves my proposition true, that the Sabbath is founded upon unchangeable and eternal facts, the same as all moral precepts are. Here, also, it seems to me that all must admit the truthfulness of this proposition.

"The principle of every moral precept existed before the fall, and would have existed if man had never fallen. This is true of the Sabbath. But all ceremonial precepts were introduced after the fall, to shadow forth redemption. . . ."

"But the Sabbath was given before man sinned, and hence was not a typical or ceremonial institution. So we find that the Sabbath is a primary institution, all the reasons for which, like those for every moral precept, existed before the fall. . . ."

"Every fact and reason upon which the Sabbath was founded did exist before man fell in Eden. Hence the record in Genesis 2:1-3, which says that God made, blessed, and set apart the Sabbath day in Eden, is true and reasonable. Hence it cannot be typical

or ceremonial.”—“*The Morality of the Sabbath*,” *D. M. Canright*, 1875, pp. 5-11.

Thus Mr. Canright shows conclusively that the Sabbath command is neither typical nor ceremonial, but is a great moral precept. Yet he later declares it to have been ceremonial and to have ended at the cross with the other ceremonies of Moses' law.

But let him continue to argue against himself. We still quote from his former publications:

“Thus the Sabbath is declared to be a divinely appointed memorial of God's great work of creation. Its importance cannot be overestimated. God instituted it for a great moral purpose, namely, to preserve in the memory of men a knowledge of His work of creation.

“Had the human family carefully observed this sacred memorial, they never would have forgotten the living God and have become atheists or the worshipers of false gods.

“‘Had all men properly kept the Sabbath, all would have known Jehovah and worshipped Him from the creation of the world to the present time, and idolatry never would have been practiced on the earth.’—*Justin Edwards*.

“The Sabbath, therefore, does have for its object the greatest of all moral principles, namely, the preservation in the earth of the knowledge of the true and living God, the Creator of the earth. The reader cannot fail to observe that, if this be so, the farther we come from creation the more important becomes the careful observance of the Sabbath. For during the first few generations, the facts of creation might have been handed down from father to son without any memorial. But now, when all such traditional knowledge has been lost, and men are becoming skeptical with regard to God's existence and the miraculous work of creation, how morally important becomes the preservation of the ancient and divinely instituted memorial of creation, God's holy rest day.”—“*The Morality of the Sabbath*,” pp. 14, 15.

“*The fact that God Himself has associated the Sabbath with the moral precepts affords conclusive proof that it is a moral institution.*”

“Fallen man has one document which came directly from the living God Himself, and that is the ten commandments. God came down personally upon Mt. Sinai amidst thunderings and lightnings and most terrible majesty, and there, in the hearing of the whole nation, He spoke from heaven, with His own voice, His moral law of ten commandments.

“Webster, in defining the moral law, says that it is ‘summarily contained in the ten commandments.’ When God spoke this law, His voice shook the earth. Heb. 12:26. With His own divine finger He then engraved it in imperishable stone (Ex. 31:18); here again indicating that this law was as imperishable and as enduring as the solid rock. It was then deposited in the ark, under the Shekinah in the holy of holies. No other part of the Bible, no other law of God, was ever given in such a solemn manner. Why was this? This question our opponents have never been able to answer. Nine of these ten commandments are universally acknowledged to be moral in their nature, and of perpetual and universal application, applying through all ages and to all nations. Look at them. 1. You shall have no other gods. 2. You shall not make and worship an image. 3. You shall not profane God’s name. 5. Honor your parents. 6. Do not kill. 7. Do not commit adultery. 8. Do not steal. 9. Do not bear false witness. 10. Do not covet.

“Reader, are not these commandments all moral, and as enduring as truth itself? There is not a shadowy or ceremonial precept in the whole ten, except it be the Sabbath. Now, we ask the reader, If the Sabbath was, unlike the other nine precepts, a mere ceremonial institution, why did God place it in the moral law? Why did He not put it where it belonged, with those precepts which are confessedly only types and shadows? Shall we impugn God’s wisdom to sustain our theories? Would God mar an otherwise perfect moral law? God’s own action gives the lie to that baseless theory. It is a true saying that a man is known by the company he keeps. Now look at the Sabbath. God, who knew its character, has placed it in the midst of a strictly moral neighborhood. It has three perfectly moral neighbors on one side, and six on the other. We claim that this important fact shows that the all-wise God has put His stamp upon the Sabbath as a moral institution. What God has joined together let no man put asunder.”—*Id.*, pp. 36-38.

“It is not a type. Types were given after the fall to shadow forth redemption; but the Sabbath points back to creation, not forward to redemption. (See Ex. 20:11.)”—*Id.*, p. 43.

“All admit that the eighth commandment, ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ is a moral commandment. Why?—Because it guards the right of property. You shall not take and appropriate to your own use that which belongs to another. The Creator, who is the author of everything, has divided time into weeks of seven days each. All these days were the Lord’s; but He, in His benevolence and goodness, has given six of them to man to be properly used in his own necessary business, but the seventh day, God’s rest day, He has reserved to Himself. The fourth precept is given to guard this Sabbath day. It forbids our appropriating to our own use that which belongs to another, viz., to God. The right of property,

then, is recognized in this commandment the same as in the eighth commandment; and, hence, if one is moral the other is also for the same reason.

"To illustrate: A wealthy man has seven apple trees, all bearing fruit. He has a poor neighbor living near him. He takes him into the orchard and tells him to use freely of the fruit of the first six trees; but the seventh one he forbids him to touch, as that he has reserved for a special purpose to himself. This would be a very generous act on the part of the rich man. Now how ungrateful and wicked it would be on the part of the poor man to use not only the fruit from the six trees, but to take that of the seventh also. It would be a grossly immoral act.

"Just so God has given us six days which we can freely use in an honorable manner; but the seventh day belongs to God. Thus the Lord says by the mouth of Isaiah: 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *My* holy day,' etc. Chap. 58:13. Again, the Lord says, 'Verily *My* Sabbaths ye shall keep.' Ex. 31:13. And so the fourth commandment says, 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.' Ex. 20:10. It is not our day, our time, nor our property. It belongs to God.

"And the fourth commandment is given to guard the Lord's right to this day. Another prophet exclaims, 'Will a man rob God? But ye say, Wherein have we robbed Thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed Me, even this whole nation.' Mal. 3:8, 9. God had reserved to Himself one tenth of all their increase. This belonged to Him. Thus He says, 'And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's; it is holy unto the Lord.' Lev. 27:30. But the people had taken these tithes which belonged to the Lord and had used them for their own benefit. In doing this they had 'robbed God.' Then a man can rob the Lord.

"If this was true in the above case, with how much greater force can it be said that a man robs God who every week takes God's holy day and appropriates it to his own worldly purposes! Verily, he is guilty of stealing. A little reflection will show that the same motive which leads a man to steal from his neighbor, also leads him to break the Sabbath. He covets his neighbor's property, that he may use it for his own selfish purposes; so he takes it without his consent. So a man covets God's holy day, that he may use it in his own worldly business or pleasure; hence he proceeds to appropriate that sacred time to his own purposes. A man who knowingly appropriates God's Sabbath to his own use is robbing God, and thus violating the very highest principle of morality. If it is wrong to rob our neighbor who is our equal, how much more wicked is it to rob God our Creator? The same moral principle, then, is involved in the Sabbath precept that is in the precept against theft; and therefore it is moral for the same reason."—*Id.*, pp. 38-41.

"The seventh-day Sabbath was placed in the moral law. Ex. 20:1-17. No others were. This is a stubborn fact which our opponents can never account for. If the Sabbath was a mere typical, shadowy, or ceremonial institution, as were the festival days of the Jews, why did God Himself put it in the moral law, and thus associate it with moral precepts? Why did He not place it with the other Jewish holy days if it was like them? Did God make a mistake and place it where it did not belong? Our opponents, with their view of the Sabbath, certainly never would have put it where God did, in the moral law. Here God has marked an important difference between the Sabbath and all other sacred days. . . .

"All other holy days grew out of man's actions as a sinner, and they would never have existed but for sin. Here we have a marked contrast which we wish the reader to distinctly notice. The Sabbath grew out of the action of a holy and infinite God, but all festival days originated in some action of man himself. (See a complete list of these days in Leviticus 23.)

"All other holy days originated this side of the fall, after types and shadows were introduced. This marks them as shadowy and typical. But the Sabbath, as we have shown, was given in Eden before types were instituted. . . .

"So many and so marked differences between God's holy Sabbath and all other holy days show that they are of very different natures,—the first was unchangeable, perpetual, and for all people; but the second was only ceremonial, temporal, and for one nation."
—*Id.*, pp. 59-61.

"From the foregoing we see that the Sabbath is an institution of the greatest importance to man physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. It has been plainly shown that men absolutely need such a day of rest from physical or mental labor. The man who does not obey this law of nature, sins against himself, and will inevitably suffer loss in the end. The social benefits of the Sabbath in promoting friendly intercourse, moral culture, and refinement of manners, are beyond all estimation even if only this life is considered.

"But it is in the holy work of religion, in man's duties to his Creator, that the highest importance of the Sabbath is seen. It sets apart a definite, regular, and oft-recurring day of rest from all worldly employments, upon which men can be free to attend to the worship of God. No other law can compare in importance with the Sabbath in preserving and promoting the knowledge and worship of the true God. We have seen that it is the sign which distinguishes the true God from all false gods. It [the Sabbath] is the memorial of the great work of creation. It is the seal to the moral law of Jehovah, without which that law would be of no authority. *This fact alone elevates the Sabbath precept in importance above any other.* We have seen that the Sabbath is a

moral precept in every sense of the term. Every argument against it falls with equal weight against one or more of the other commandments of the moral law.

DANGER OF WORLDLINESS

“Our great and constant danger is that we shall become ‘choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life’ (Luke 8:14); and so bear no fruit for the Lord. To obviate this, the Lord has interposed the Sabbath after six days of labor, to break up the tide of worldliness and call man’s attention back to God. If it were not for this provision, the business of the world would absorb all man’s attention, and God would soon be forgotten. Man needs a constant reminder of his duty to God, an oft-recurring test of his own spiritual condition. For this purpose, no other precept is like the Sabbath.

“We have before shown that the principle involved in the violation of all the other commandments is also involved in the violation of the Sabbath. A man covets his neighbor’s property. This leads him to steal it. So a man covets God’s time for his own work; hence he proceeds to take it and use it for himself, and he thus robs God. A man who will knowingly and deliberately use God’s holy day for his own worldly, selfish purposes, would also steal if he could do it with the same impunity. If a man will steal from his Creator, will he not from his fellow men? I know that men do not like to regard it in this light, but it is true, notwithstanding. When we come to look at the claims and sacredness of the Sabbath day in a proper light, it must be seen that it is no slight offense to disregard the Sabbath. I cannot conceive how a man could set at naught God’s authority in so defiant a manner as this.

“Look at the facts a moment. The omnipotent God, whose glory fills all heaven, whose hands have made the universe, has created our earth, ourselves, and every blessing which we enjoy. To commemorate this great work, He has set apart, as sacred to Himself, the Sabbath day. With a voice that shook the earth, He has forbidden us to use this day in doing our own work. With a full knowledge of these facts before him, with the law of God pointing out his duty, with the eyes of Jehovah upon him, a man arises Sabbath morning and deliberately proceeds to use this holy time in his own business. How must such an act appear in the eyes of God? How will it appear on the record in the judgment? What act could puny man perform which would more deliberately set at naught the law and authority of the great Creator? Reader, we beseech you to stop and think seriously of this matter, and consider whether the observance of the Sabbath is not of greater importance than you have hitherto considered it.”—*Id.*, pp. 89-91.

“With all these facts before us, we appeal to the reader’s judgment and conscience to decide whether or not the Sabbath is of so little importance as its opponents are wont to represent it. Is it not, on the other hand, the keystone of God’s great moral law, without which the law would have no strength to stand? Dear reader, as you value your soul and the favor of your Creator, do not pass by the light which God in His providence is now causing to shine out so clearly upon the subject of His holy but down-trodden Sabbath day. May the Lord help you to turn away your feet from the Sabbath, and call it ‘a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable.’”—*Id.*, p. 96.

What a pity that, after seeing so clearly the light concerning the great moral obligation of the Sabbath, Mr. Canright should later have gone so far into darkness that he could no longer discern this light. He referred to the Sabbath as the keystone of the great moral law, and then later, when he renounced Seventh-day Adventism, he proceeded to try to remove this keystone and thus destroy the law in its entirety.

In 1898 D. L. Moody published his little book, “Weighed and Wanting,” devoted to a discussion of the ten commandments. Although not an observer of the seventh day, yet in his chapter on the fourth commandment Mr. Moody speaks of those who try to excuse themselves from the obligation to keep the Sabbath, as follows:

“But some one says: ‘Mr. Moody, what are you going to do? I have to work seven days a week or starve.’

“Then starve! Wouldn’t it be a grand thing to have a martyr in the nineteenth century? ‘The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.’ Some one says the seed is getting very low; it has been a long time since we have had any seed. I would give something to erect a monument to such a martyr to his fidelity to God’s law. I would go around the world to attend his funeral.

“We want today men who will make up their minds to do what is right, and stand by it if the heavens tumble on their heads. . . . Let men call you narrow and bigoted, but be man enough to stand by God’s law, and you will have power and blessing. That is the kind of Christianity we want just now in this country. Any man can go with the crowd, but we want men who will go against the current.

“Sabbath breaker, are you ready to step into the scales?”—*“Weighed and Wanting,” pp. 61, 62.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE SABBATH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

MR. CANRIGHT makes a strong effort to prove that the seventh-day Sabbath was not carried over into New Testament times. We wish to call attention here to some of the very extravagant statements made by him on this point. Let the reader note carefully the following quotations from his book:

“Strange to say, the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned in the whole New Testament.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*,” p. 267.

“On all other points the New Testament is clear and full. In it we have chapter after chapter, epistle after epistle, and book after book packed full of instruction on every Christian duty in every possible phase of it. The duty or the sin covered by each of the other nine commandments is directly named many times over in the New Testament. But the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned. . . . ‘Another remarkable fact is that the fourth commandment is not repeated in the New Testament, that no Christian was ever commanded to observe it.’”—*Id.*, pp. 265, 266.

Now, at first blush, this looks pretty bad for the Sabbath, doesn't it? with all these references to the other nine commandments of the moral law, and *not even one mention* of the Sabbath or the fourth commandment. Not even *one* reference to it “in the whole New Testament”!

The strange thing is that after making this very positive statement, that there is no mention made in the New Testament of our duty to keep the Sabbath, he devotes an entire chapter of his “*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*” (Chapter XII) to an effort to refute the New Testament Scriptures where the seventh-day Sabbath *is* mentioned, and finally admits, on page 273, that it is mentioned fifty-nine times by New

Testament writers! On page 267 he asserts with great emphasis that there is not *one* such mention of it; on page 273 he finds that there are *fifty-nine* such references. Here is a discrepancy that is certainly very difficult to understand.

But let us permit Mr. Canright as a Seventh-day Adventist to reply to Canright as a Baptist on this point also. Before he renounced the moral law and became a no-law advocate, he wrote:

"It is claimed that nine are referred to while the fourth is not; but this is false. The Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament oftener than any other of the ten commandments, being not less than fifty-nine times in all. It is worthy of notice that in all these numerous references not one word is spoken derogatory to the honor and sacredness which it had always possessed."—"*The Two Laws*," p. 120.

"The New Testament was written by Christians, in the Christian dispensation, for Christians. It was written by Inspiration; hence it uses Christian language, and tells us what Christians did. Every word of it was written years after the resurrection of Christ. Now let us see what these Christian Scriptures say upon the Sabbath question. [Let the reader keep in mind his later statement that it is not *once* mentioned.—AUTHOR.]

"The Son of God Himself lived upon our earth over thirty years. He worked with His father as a carpenter. He labored six days in a week, and rested upon the Sabbath. 'And He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up; and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.' Luke 4:16. Returning to the place of His nativity, it is particularly mentioned that He still observed the Sabbath according to His former custom. We have, then, the example of God's own Son for keeping the seventh-day Sabbath.

"When questioned on this subject of the Sabbath, He said, 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Mark 2:27. And the book of Genesis tells us just when and how God made the Sabbath for man. If it was made for man, it is because man needed it. Next, Christ says of Himself, 'Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' Verse 28. Which day is this?—The seventh, as all know. This, then, is the Lord's day—the day of which He is Lord.

"In Matthew 12:1-12, the Pharisees accused Jesus of breaking the Sabbath because He disregarded their silly regulations concerning it. He simply taught His disciples to eat upon the Sabbath when they were hungry. Jesus defended what He had done by referring to the example of David and the priests as recorded in

the Old Testament, and concluded by saying, 'Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days.' Verse 12. Thus He recognizes not only the Sabbath, but the law of the Sabbath, in the New Testament.

"When predicting the overthrow of Jerusalem, which occurred thirty-nine years after His resurrection, He said to His disciples, 'But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' Matt. 24:20. Here He points them forward thirty-nine years into the gospel age. He tells them that they will have to flee for their lives, but commands them to pray the Lord that they may not be compelled to flee either in the winter or on the Sabbath day. If they should go in winter, they might perish. But why not flee upon the Sabbath day? If it was not a sacred day, they could flee on that day as well as on any other. This text, then, plainly shows that not only was the Sabbath to exist so many years after the resurrection of Christ, but that it was still to be regarded as a holy day. If not, there would be no reason in this command. Here, then, we find a New Testament command from the lips of Jesus Himself for the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath.

WHICH DAY IS THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH?

"Sunday keepers assert that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, or the Sabbath of the New Testament. Seventh-day Adventists maintain that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the New Testament. Go into a church on the first day of the week, and you hear the minister call it the Sabbath. Go among the seventh-day people on Saturday, and they call that the Sabbath. Now, who is right? We appeal to the New Testament.

"'In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene,' etc. Matt. 28:1. Notice particularly; here are two days. One is the Sabbath day. 'In the end of *the Sabbath*.' Very well, there is one day, then, that is the Sabbath. Now which day is this? Sunday keepers say it is the first day of the week, and we say that it is the seventh day. Read further. 'In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn *toward the first day of the week*.' Reader, which is the Sabbath day? It cannot be the first day, because the one which is called the Sabbath is the day before the first day. The Sabbath is ended before the first day comes. Remember this is not the testimony of the Old Testament. It is from the Gospel that we are reading, the Christian Scriptures, the New Testament; and hence, if you please, the Sabbath here mentioned is the 'Christian Sabbath.'

"Here is another text: 'When the Sabbath was past, . . . very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher.' Mark 16:1, 2. Notice carefully; here are two days

spoken of again. One of them is the Sabbath. Which day is it? Is it the first day? Surely not, because the Sabbath is past before the first day comes. 'When the Sabbath was past, . . . the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher.' Remember this is New Testament, not Old,—gospel, not law,—Christian, not Jewish, testimony. To this we appeal. Which day is the Christian Sabbath? This was written a long time after the resurrection, written by a Christian, and for Christians. Reader, which is the Christian Sabbath?

"Once more: 'And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment.' Luke 23:56. Thus did the holy women who had followed Christ all His life and were acquainted with all His teaching. This was written thirty years after the resurrection. It is in the Christian Scriptures. What does it say? They kept the Sabbath day. What Sabbath day? 'The Sabbath day according to the commandment.' Then it is the right Sabbath, the one the law requires. Now what day was this? The next verse will settle it. 'Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher.' Notice, the next day after the day they had kept, was the first day of the week. Thus, reader, the first day of the week cannot be the Sabbath day according to the commandment, because the Christians had kept the Sabbath day, the day before the first day of the week. Do not think we are reading from the Old Testament. No, indeed; this is New Testament Scripture.

THE SABBATH IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

"We turn to Acts, which was written some thirty-three years this side the commencement of the gospel age, and written by a Christian. It shows us the language of the apostolic Christians touching the ancient Sabbath, and how they used it. We find them always calling it 'the Sabbath,' just as it had been called in the old dispensation, and using it for religious worship as of old. Of Paul and Barnabas it says: 'They came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.' Acts 13:14. This was the seventh day, the day on which the Jews worshipped. Inspiration here calls it *the* Sabbath day, not *a* Sabbath day, nor the old Sabbath day, nor the Jewish Sabbath day, nor the day that used to be the Sabbath, but '*the* Sabbath day.' . . .

"Paul, in his sermon referring to that day, says that the prophets 'are read every Sabbath day.' Verse 27. Here the apostle calls it definitely 'the Sabbath day.' When he had finished his discourse, 'the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.' Verse 42. *Here, even the Gentiles called it the Sabbath.* Once more: 'And the next Sabbath

day came almost the whole city together.' Verse 44. Luke, the historian, here calls it the Sabbath, and records the meetings they held upon it. James, in Acts 15:21, says the Scriptures are 'read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.' Thus, James still designates that as the Sabbath day.

"Once more: 'And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a riverside, where prayer was wont to be made.' Acts 16:13. On what day?—The Sabbath. Who will contradict the Scriptures, and say that it was not the Sabbath? Every one holds that the day here referred to was the seventh day; and this record is in the New Testament. This day, then, is the 'Christian Sabbath.'

"Again: 'Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.' Acts 17:2. It was Paul's custom to observe the Sabbath, as we here see. On what days did he preach there?—On the *Sabbath days*. But this was on the seventh day, not on the first. Which, then, is the Sabbath day, according to Paul? . . . Thus we find that the seventh day is always and invariably termed '*the Sabbath*' in the New Testament, while the first day is never so called. . . .

"Here we think we have plainly found the 'Christian Sabbath;' that is, the Sabbath day which the Christian Scriptures plainly teach. We ask, then, By what authority do you apply the term 'Sabbath' to the first day of the week? God has never changed it, and why should you?

"In conclusion we ask, Where did the Lord ever give you permission to work on His holy day? Who gave you liberty to use it for secular work? When was the blessing or sanctification removed from it? Where do you find in the New Testament that a Christian ever worked on the seventh day? We pray you to consider these things in the light of the judgment."—"*The Christian Sabbath*," by D. M. Canright, pp. 2-7.

A FATAL ADMISSION

Mr. Canright makes another admission in his book which is fatal to his Sabbath-abolition argument, when he says:

"All church historians agree that the Jewish Christians continued to observed the seventh day, even for some time after the fall of Jerusalem, as we have seen.

"Philip Schaff, the greatest of living authors, in his 'History of the Apostolical Church,' page 118, says: 'So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, Scripturally observed the Sabbath.'"—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 277.

This is very important. The "Jewish Christians" all continued to observe the Sabbath for the first generation of the Christian era, "even for some time after the fall of Jerusalem." That, then, took in Paul, Peter, James, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, and John the revelator. It included the New Testament writers, with the exception of Luke, who was probably a Greek. These persons were observers of the seventh-day Sabbath throughout the first generation, that is to say, as long as they lived, for they died before the first century of the Christian era was passed. They kept the Sabbath till they died. They spoke of no change when they wrote their Gospels or Epistles, whether writing to Jews or Gentiles, and they made no change in their practice; they "Scripturally observed the Sabbath." That is, they recognized that the Scriptural injunctions to keep the Sabbath are still binding in the Christian era, and they kept it according to the Scriptures. To this agree the words of Luke, the Greek, as he speaks of Christ's followers in connection with His death and burial: "They returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56.

Mr. Canright inquires:

"How much, then, does it prove in favor of the Jewish Sabbath to find that it was still called 'the Sabbath,' or that it was kept by the Jewish Christians, or even by Paul himself?"—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 278.

We answer, *Much every way*, chiefly because these facts clearly reveal that the church of the apostles knew nothing whatsoever of any change having been made in the Sabbath. They knew nothing of the original Sabbath having been abolished or of Sunday having taken its place.

But did not the Gentile Christians who lived in the days of the apostles perhaps make the change? No, for they became Christians through the labors of these Jewish Christians and were instructed by them.

The Gentiles were never commissioned to take over and

remodel the cause later. The Lord did not give one line of instruction to the new church through the Jewish Christians and another line through Gentile converts. All the teaching was the reverse of that. If men accepted Jesus, they were then members of His family and counted as Christians. They were all to be governed by one rule, to be of one mind, and to speak the same thing. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:27, 28.

Therefore, if the Christians of Christ's time were "all one," and if all the Jewish Christians kept the Scriptural Sabbath during the first century, the Gentile converts must also have done the same. The entire Christian church started out as a Sabbath-keeping church, and there was no thought of changing to Sunday until apostasy set in later on, and the church began to depart from the plain commandments of God and to follow the traditions of men.

In Chapter X of his book Mr. Canright tries to build up an argument for Sunday observance on apostolic example, but the admission that for the first century all Jewish Christians continued to keep the Sabbath completely demolishes his argument. The apostles were all Jewish Christians, and if they all continued to keep the Sabbath during the first century, or as long as they lived, then the apostolic example is all on the Sabbath side. It is wholly in favor of seventh-day observance.

Not one of the apostles or disciples of Christ ever once kept Sunday or indicated that he knew anything about a change having been made in the Sabbath. No mention is made of the first day of the week as having become a holy day or a day of rest and worship. No command is given for any one to keep it. God never rested upon it; Christ never kept it; the apostles knew nothing about it; and for at least a century of the Christian era the church members all continued to keep the Scriptural Sabbath.

This Scriptural Sabbath is mentioned fifty-nine times in the New Testament, as Mr. Canright admits. It is called the Sabbath, and Jesus declares Himself to be Lord of it. Mark 2:28. But Sunday keeping is not mentioned at all, and wherever the first day of the week is spoken of, it is referred to as one of the six working days to which no holiness was attached.

But we shall permit Mr. Canright as a Seventh-day Adventist to speak on this point. He has already shown his ability to find fifty-nine references to the Sabbath in the New Testament, and now we will let him tell us what he knew about Sunday in the New Testament. The following is from his pen:

"Paul says, 'Where no law is, there is no transgression.' Rom. 4:15. As there is no law of God for keeping the first day, there can be no sin in working on it; for Paul says again, 'Sin is not imputed when there is no law.' Rom. 5:13. Then why keep Sunday? God does not leave men to guess at their duty, but He states plainly whatever He wishes done. Does He wish men to keep the seventh day? How explicitly He has said so. Ex. 20:8-11. How plainly baptism and the Lord's supper are enjoined. Mark 16:15, 16; 1 Cor. 11:23-26. So if the Lord wished us to keep the first day, would He not have plainly said so? Certainly; but He has said no such thing.

FIRST-DAY TEXTS EXAMINED

"Let us examine every text in which the first day of the week is mentioned in the New Testament, and we shall thus learn all the Lord has said about it. There are but eight texts. Here is the first: 'In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher.' Matt. 28:1. This is all that Matthew says about it. He relates that the angel opened the tomb; that the women saw him, ran to tell the apostles, and met Jesus on the way; but not a hint is given that there is to be any change of the Sabbath, not a word is said about keeping the first day in honor of the resurrection. Think of this.

"Next, Mark mentions the first day twice. 'And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun.' 'Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.' Chap. 16:2, 9. This is all the mention he makes of the day. Here, again, there is a profound silence as to any change of the Sabbath or any sacredness for the first day. There is not the slightest intimation

of any such thing. Read the whole chapter and see for yourself.

“Luke mentions the first day only once. ‘Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.’ Chap. 24:1. What does this say about the change of the Sabbath?—Nothing. They had kept the Sabbath according to the commandment the day before. Chap. 23:56. What intimation is there here that the first day then became a holy day? The candid reader will admit that there is not the slightest reference to such a thing. Yet these are the texts always relied upon by Sunday keepers to sustain their position. Luke does state that two of the disciples went that day seven and a half miles, on foot, to Emmaus. Verse 13. What were they going there for? The circumstances indicate that they resided there, and they were going home. Jesus walked with them and made Himself known to them. Verses 15-31. Then they went back to Jerusalem to tell the others. Fifteen miles they walked that day. . . . Mark 16:12, 13. While they were eating supper, and doubting and disputing about the resurrection, Jesus came in and upbraided them for their unbelief. . . . Luke 24:38-43. Certainly, then, they, were not keeping that day to commemorate an event in which they did not yet believe! . . .

“John mentions the first day twice, stating substantially the same facts as the others. ‘The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher.’ Chap. 20:1. She ran and told Peter and John. Then they went to see if it was so. Later, Jesus appeared to Mary, and sent her to tell the others. Verses 11-18. ‘Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.’ Verse 19. This is all that John says of the first day. Reader, how much do you find here about the change of the Sabbath? Like the others, John is silent upon this subject. He makes no reference to it; he simply states the events that occurred at the resurrection of Jesus. There he leaves it.

“But were not the apostles assembled together when Jesus met them? Yes, at their own home, eating supper. John 20:10; Mark 16:14. (See Acts 1:13.) And where else should they be? So there is no evidence here of any religious meeting held on that day.

“John mentions the first day twice, but does not call it the Sabbath, the Lord’s day, nor by any other sacred title. He says nothing about the disciples’ keeping it, nor does he record any intimation from the Lord that they should keep it. There is not

even an inference to that effect in the four Gospels, and the whole argument in favor of it is pure assumption.

"Another Sunday meeting is claimed from verse 26: 'And after eight days, again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.' This did not occur on Sunday, but as late as Monday evening. Verse 19. *After eight days* is not on the eighth day. . . .

"But suppose it had been the first day of the week; that does not prove that it was the Sabbath, nor that there was any sacredness to the day. The disciples were not even holding a meeting. They were 'within,' that is, at home. Verse 10: 'Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.' This is where they were when the event occurred which is recorded in verse 26. (See Acts 1:13.) Jesus came because Thomas was there; but there is not a word, or even a hint, that the day was sacred.

"The next time Jesus met them was on a fishing day. John 21:1-6. They all went fishing, and toiled all night, but caught nothing. In the morning Jesus stood on the shore, and told them where to cast the net to get a good draught. Was this on Sunday? Then it is a working day.

"If it were not on Sunday, then Jesus met them on any day, just as it happened. So we see from Acts 1:1-4 that His farewell meeting with them was on Thursday. It was on the fortieth day after His resurrection. Verse 3. By a moment's reckoning it will be seen that it fell on Thursday, as all agree. Thursday is ascension day the world over. So the claim that Jesus always met with His disciples on the first day of the week is utterly false. As we have seen, the day of His resurrection was one of the greatest confusion among His disciples; the next time He met them was on Monday evening, the next time was on a fishing day, and the last was on Thursday. So much for the example of Christ in favor of Sunday keeping. . . .

"Next, Acts 20:7-11 is supposed to furnish some little proof for first-day observance. 'And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together.' Then a young man fell from a window, and being taken up dead, was restored to life by Paul. And when he 'had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed.' We notice these facts: 1. The first day is not called the Sabbath, Lord's day, or by any other sacred title. 2. This is the only religious meeting upon the first day of the week of which we have any record in the New Testament. This is remarkable, if that were the common day of meeting. But we have a record of eighty-four Sabbaths which

Paul kept, and on which he preached. (See Acts 13:14, 44; 16:13; 17:2; 18:1-4, 11.) 3. Nothing is said about its being their custom to meet on that day. 4. There is no record that they ever met on that day before this occasion or afterward. 5. But what settles the whole matter is the simple fact that it was only an evening meeting. When they assembled, Paul began to preach to them, and 'continued his speech till midnight.' After breaking bread, he again talked 'till break of day,' and then went on his journey. Evening meetings are frequently held on all days of the week. No one thinks of calling a day holy for this reason. So in the above case; this meeting does not furnish the slightest evidence that Sunday was a holy day. Moreover, this was not an ordinary meeting, but a very uncommon one. It was Paul's farewell meeting (verse 25); hence it lasted all night. A dead man was raised. It was for these reasons that it was mentioned, and not because of any sacredness belonging to the day. Then there is not a particle of evidence here for Sunday observance.

"Only one more text mentions the first day; viz., 1 Corinthians 16:2: 'Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' From this a public meeting for Sabbath worship on the first day is inferred. But what is said here about keeping that day as the Sabbath, or even holding meetings on that day? Not an intimation of such a thing is given. Paul does not say that when they came together for meetings they should bring their gifts, nor that they should put them into the public collection box, nor anything of that nature. 'Let every one of you lay by him in store,' is the direction; that is, at home, by himself. The original Greek term means by himself, at home, as the best critics say on this passage.

"Now, reader, you have before you all the texts in the New Testament that mention the first day of the week in any manner. You must see that they do not intimate that the day has any sacredness, or that there is an example for keeping it, or any commandment that any one should observe it. The 'Lord's day' of Revelation 1:10 is the seventh day, as may be seen by Exodus 20:8-11; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28."—*"Sunday Not the Sabbath,"* by D. M. Canright, pp. 1-8.

That is well done, Mr. Canright. Now we will give you an opportunity to answer another one of your Sabbath objections.

In his book under review Mr. Canright declares:

"That the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) fell on Sunday has been believed and maintained by Christians in all ages."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 200.

But just a few years before, he had completely exploded this theory in a leaflet entitled, "Sunday Not the Sabbath," from which we quote the following:

"A desperate endeavor is made to find evidence for Sunday keeping from the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4); but there is not the remotest hint of it here. 'And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind.' Verses 1, 2. Then the Holy Spirit rested upon them. But what has that to do with Sunday keeping? Sunday observance is not mentioned, nor even referred to. It is not stated what day of the week it was, as that was a matter of no importance.

"It was the *Pentecost* which was to be signaled, and not the day of the week. *The very best scholars, even among the observers of Sunday, admit that Pentecost fell that year upon the Sabbath, or Saturday.* Professor Hackett says, 'It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signaled by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday.'—*Comment on original text.*

"Olshausen says, 'The fiftieth fell, therefore, it appears, upon Saturday.'

"Dean Alford, in his 'New Testament for English Readers,' remarks, 'It is probable, however, that it was on the Sabbath, i. e., if we reckon from Saturday, the 16th of Nisan.' If the day of the week on which that Pentecost fell was to be observed, we should at least expect that we should be informed which day it was. But we are not."—*Pages 5, 6.*

In the last analysis, Seventh-day Adventists are not really concerned at all as to whether Pentecost came on Sabbath, Sunday, or some other day of the week, for they have never rested their case on so uncertain and vague a basis as the supposed relationship of the Sabbath to various ceremonial festivals of the Jews, such as Pentecost. Seventh-day Adventists build their claim for the sacredness of the Sabbath in the Christian era upon the firm foundation of a clear-cut "Thus saith the Lord," found in the fourth precept of the divinely given ten commandments, which commandments virtually all the Christian world confesses to be the moral code for all time and all ages. It is interesting to note, however, inasmuch as opponents such as Mr. Canright draw in his Pentecost argument, and attempt to make a last stand on the claim that Pentecost

came on Sunday, that even among Sunday-keeping theologians themselves there is no agreement that Pentecost even came on Sunday. This is a strange plight indeed for the advocates of Sunday!

In renouncing Seventh-day Adventism Mr. Canright argues that Sunday should be kept as a memorial of Christ's resurrection, saying:

"It is the grandest and best-known fact in all the earth today, that the Christian church has a memorial day, the day of the Lord's resurrection."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 196.

To which argument he himself had formerly replied as follows:

"Should we not, then, celebrate the resurrection of Christ? Yes, but the Lord never told us to keep Sunday for that purpose. God has given us baptism, burial in water, as the fitting memorial of this. 'Therefore we are *buried with Him by baptism*.' Rom. 6:4. We are buried in the water just as Jesus was in the earth. Then we are raised up out of the water, 'also in the likeness of His resurrection.' Verse 5. Again, 'Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him.' Col. 2:12. Baptism, then, is the divinely appointed memorial of the burial and resurrection of Jesus. It is appropriate. To be buried in the water and raised out of it, resembles the burial and resurrection of Christ, which it commemorates."—"*Sunday Not the Sabbath*," by D. M. Canright, page 8.

WAS SUNDAY COMMANDED BY CHRIST DURING THE FORTY DAYS BETWEEN HIS RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION?

Mr. Canright, after leaving the Seventh-day Adventists, quotes a priest of New York on the matter of Sunday observance as follows:

"John Ankatell, A. M., priest of the diocese of New York, writes in the *Outlook*, July, 1889, says of Sunday, the Lord's day: 'We think it was given by our Lord to the apostles during the great forty days after His resurrection, but we cannot *prove* this.' He states the Catholic doctrine exactly; viz., that the change was made by Christ and the apostles, but that the Scriptures are not

plain enough on this point to prove it; hence we have to rely upon Catholic authority, which says it was made in New Testament times."—*“Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,”* p. 214.

It seems to us that this is as clear a case of groping in the dark as we have ever witnessed. No evidence can be found for Sunday observance, but that fact does not deter those who are determined to substitute that day for God’s Sabbath. Failing to find a “Thus saith the Lord” for their doctrine on this point, they find the next best thing,—a Catholic priest of New York, who *thinks* the Sunday command was given to the disciples by the Lord during the forty days after His resurrection! Of course, this priest is honest enough to add that he “cannot prove this,” but then the very fact that he *thought it*, was evidence to Mr. Canright that it must be true.

We wonder now what this priest’s supposition is based upon? Paul says that he shunned not to declare all the counsel of God, and yet he declared nothing about Christ’s having secretly told the disciples about Sunday’s taking the place of the holy Sabbath. Strange, isn’t it, that he should have forgotten so important a matter as that! And one would think that Luke or John would have thought to mention it, but no, they must have forgotten also. What a pity that the New Testament should have been marred by this failure on their part! Surely, if they expected plain, ordinary folk down here in the twentieth century to keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath, they should have made it plainer. As it is, they have left us without any hint or instruction whatsoever on this point of Sunday sacredness. But then, of course, there is the New York priest. Yes, there is the priest!

But, dear reader, did you catch that further admission of Mr. Canright, quoted above? He says of this priest:

“He states the Catholic doctrine exactly; viz., that the change was made by Christ and the apostles, *but that the Scriptures are not plain enough on this point to prove it*; hence we have to rely upon Catholic authority, which says it was made in New Testament times.”

Now, surely that is an astonishing admission for a Protestant minister who is a Sunday advocate to make. The Scriptures are not plain enough on this point (of Sunday sacredness) to prove it. Quite right, Mr. Canright, they are not. We are glad that you, by citing this quotation as evidence, admit that truth at last. We are glad it is frankly stated that we have to rely upon Catholic authority for information on this point. That clears the atmosphere considerably. We can now see clearly upon what platform you stand. "The Scriptures are not plain enough on this point to prove it," so the *thinking* of a New York priest of the Roman Church is substituted!

True, there is no information in "the Scriptures" about Sunday sacredness; therefore, Sunday advocates do "*have to rely upon Catholic authority*," the same source from which people get "authority" for purgatory, prayers for the dead, mediation of the virgin Mary, and other doctrines unknown to the apostles, one of which was Sunday sacredness.

Let it be known, dear reader, that there is one thing upon which the Scriptures *are* clear, all the way from Genesis to Revelation, and that is that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God" (Ex. 20:10); that this day was sanctified in Eden, set apart for the holy and religious use of men, as a great memorial of creation; that it is *God's holy day* (Isa. 58:13); that Jesus is Lord of it (Mark 2:28); that Jesus kept it (Luke 4:16); that the disciples still kept it after the resurrection of our Lord (Luke 23:56); and that it was "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10).

There is no need to find out what the New York Catholic priest thinks about that. It is written in letters of fire, as it were, and was dictated by the Holy Ghost. It was spoken from heaven by the omnipotent God; it was engraved upon stone with His finger; it was substantiated by Jesus by both precept and example; it was accepted without question by all the inspired writers. In fact, it is so plain that "the wayfaring men, though fools," need not err therein.

Shall all this clear, shining testimony be discarded for the passing thought of a New York Roman Catholic priest?

THE LORD'S DAY

In an attempt to prove that Sunday is the Lord's day, Mr. Canright says:

"Those who observe Sunday say that they do it in honor of the resurrection of Christ upon that day, and that this practice was derived from the apostles and has been continued in the church ever since. Let us see. 'The Lord's day' is a term now commonly applied to the first day of the week, in honor of the Lord's resurrection on that day. Thus: 'We believe the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.'—*'Baptist Church Directory,'* p. 171. . . . So every dictionary, lexicon, and cyclopedia applies that term to the first day."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 186.

Here Mr. Canright begins his great adventure among the lexicons, dictionaries, encyclopedias, church Fathers, etc., in a desperate effort to turn up some semblance of proof for Sunday observance. He can find nothing whatsoever in the Bible, as he has so frequently and emphatically stated in the quotations we have cited from his own writings, so in his desperation he is driven to other sources. He starts in with the "Baptist Church Directory," and then wanders through the annals of medieval ecclesiastical history, searching for what cannot be found in Scripture. In this field he fares far better than when he seeks proof in the New Testament.

Calvin is quoted by him as saying:

"The ancients have, not without sufficient reason, substituted what we call the Lord's day in the room of the Sabbath."—*Ibid.*

But, we inquire, how does this help us in this matter? Who were these "ancients"? In what generation did they live? Were they Catholics, pagans, or early Christians? And if they were either, what authority did they have to tamper with the immutable law of the great God? Who made these ancients to be our lawgivers? "There is one Lawgiver, who is able

to save and to destroy." James 4:12. "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King; He will save us." Isa. 33:22.

Who, then, are these ancients who presume to tamper with what God has done? Away with them!

"If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: *but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.* And the people answered and said, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other gods." Joshua 24:15, 16.

JESUS VERSUS HUMAN AUTHORITY

Mr. Canright quotes from statutes of the kings of England; from Danish and Saxon laws; from Catholic councils; from Emperor Constantine; and a score of so-called Catholic Fathers, several of whom are proved impostors and tricksters, in a further effort to bolster up his Lord's day theory. Now the thing that strikes one as more than passing strange is the fact that, in an effort to prove which day is the Lord's day, the testimony of almost every one else is sought except that of the Lord Himself.

Why not inquire of the Lord as to which is His day? Perchance He would know more about it than the learned writers of dictionaries, the pagan emperor Constantine, or Henry IV of England. Why not at least hear what He has to say about the matter? What harm could it have done for Mr. Canright to tell us what is written in the Book of books about the Lord's day? Just this: it would have completely upset his entire theory. For the Lord and Mr. Canright are not in agreement upon this matter.

Let us first note a statement in the fourth commandment: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Whose Sabbath is it?—The Sabbath of the Lord. It is His day. He claims it. As His voice rolled through the earth, He de-

clared this one day to be His. When, we inquire, has His voice been heard again, releasing this claim? When did the earth shake with the announcement from the throne that Sunday was now to be substituted for the Sabbath? When?—*Never!* That change was made by man, not God.

Again the Lord declares: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *My holy day.*" Isa. 58:13. Which day is the Lord's day? He definitely claims the Sabbath, the seventh day, as His. He declares it to be holy, and calls upon His people not to trample it underfoot and disregard it, as Mr. Canright would so gladly have them do.

But this is not all. When Jesus was here in the flesh, He made another pronouncement on this question which leaves absolutely no room for doubt or quibbling. His words are recorded in Mark 2:27, 28: "He said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

So the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. That day, then, must of necessity be *the Lord's day*. It is the day which He made for man's rest and benefit.

No such claims were ever made by the Lord regarding Sunday. Jesus said nothing about a Sunday Lord's day. That is found only in the dictionaries, and the musty volumes of history written after the papal apostasy set in. That idea is absolutely foreign to the Bible. Only one Lord's day is recognized in the Scriptures, and that is the original Sabbath. It was, therefore, the seventh-day Sabbath of which John spoke when he said, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev. 1:10. John was one of those Christians of the early church whom Mr. Canright admits kept the Sabbath during the first century, hence he speaks of that day just as Jesus had spoken of it. Jesus said He was Lord of the Sabbath day, and John records that he had a heavenly vision on that day. How any one could possibly read Sunday into this text we cannot understand.

On this point Dr. Summerbell, of the Christian Church, says:

"Many suppose that they must denominate the first day of the week the 'Lord's day;' but we have no certain scripture for this. The phrase 'Lord's day' occurs but once in the Bible: 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day,' and there probably refers to the day of which Christ said: 'The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day,' as the whole book of Revelation has a strong Jewish bearing." —*"History of the Christian Church,"* by N. Summerbell, D. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, and First President of Union Christian College: Editor of the "Christian Pulpit," "Discussions," "Church History," etc., p. 152. Cincinnati, 1873.

CANRIGHT APPEALS TO THE FATHERS

Mr. Canright's chief appeal on his Sunday-Lord's-day theory is to the Catholic Fathers, and he offers their testimony as a ground of faith for the Christian church. Regarding the reliability of these sources of Christian doctrine we wish to quote the following statements from recognized church leaders and historians:

"The Fathers of the second and third centuries were not regarded as safe guides even by their Christian contemporaries. . . . Tertullian, who, in point of learning, vigor, and genius, stands at the head of the Latin writers of this period, was connected with a party of gloomy fanatics. Origen, the most voluminous and erudite of the Greek Fathers, was excommunicated as a heretic. If we estimate these authors as they were appreciated by the early Church of Rome, we must pronounce their writings of little value. Tertullian, as a Montanist, was under the ban of the Roman bishop. . . . Origen was treated by the Roman Church as a man under sentence of excommunication. . . .

"Nothing can be more unsatisfactory, or rather childish, than the explanations of Holy Writ sometimes given by these ancient expositors. . . . Very few of the Fathers of this period were acquainted with Hebrew, so that, as a class, they were miserably qualified for the interpretation of the Scriptures. Even Origen himself must have had a very imperfect knowledge of the language of the Old Testament. In consequence of their literary deficiencies, the Fathers of the second and third centuries occasionally commit the most ridiculous blunders."—*"The Ancient Church,"* Dr. William D. Killen, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, pars. 33, 34.

"There are but few of them [the Fathers] whose pages are not rife with errors,—errors of method, errors of fact, errors of his-

tory, of grammar, and even in doctrine. This is the language of simple truth, not of slighting disparagement."—*"The History of Interpretation,"* Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D. D., pp. 162, 163.

"The writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers have unhappily, for the most part, come down to us in a condition very little worthy of confidence, partly because under the name of these men, so highly venerated in the church, writings were early forged for the purpose of giving authority to particular opinions or principles; and partly because their own writings which were extant, became interpolated in subservience to a Jewish hierarchical interest, which aimed to crush the free spirit of the gospel."—*"General History of the Christian Religion and Church,"* Dr. Augustus Neander, Vol. I, Appendix, Sec. 4. "Notices of the More Eminent Church Teachers," p. 657.

"Books bearing venerable names—Clement, Dionysius, Isidore—were forged for the purpose of supplying authorities for opinions that lacked the sanction of antiquity."—*"The History of Freedom,"* John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton (R. C.), p. 513.

"Several works ascribed to these Fathers, are known to be spurious; others are doubtful; and those which are generally received as genuine are not free from interpolations."—*"Sketches of Church History,"* by Wharey, First Century, p. 26.

"But of these [the Fathers] we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine, their authority is with me, nothing. The word of God alone contains my creed."—Dr. Adam Clarke, *Comment on Proverbs 8*.

"When God's word is by the Fathers expounded, construed, and glossed over, then, in my judgment, it is even as when one strains milk through a coal sack, which must needs spoil and make the milk black. God's word of itself is pure, clean, bright, and clear; but through the doctrines, books, and writings of the Fathers, it is darkened, falsified, and spoiled."—*"Table Talk,"* by Martin Luther, p. 281.

CANRIGHT SHIFTS TO ROMAN CATHOLIC POSITION

This, then, is the ground upon which Mr. Canright chose to stand after he forsook the law of God, and surely he was sinking in the mire. He had clearly forsaken the commandments of God for the traditions of men. Had he become a Catholic, we could better understand his appeal to these ques-

tionable Catholic sources; but he claimed still to be a Protestant, and yet stepped down from the solid Protestant platform of the Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and practice, onto the shifting sands of the Catholic position of the Bible plus tradition; with tradition above the Bible.

The Roman Catholic position on this point is clearly set down in the following terse quotations:

"A rule of faith, or a competent guide to heaven, must be able to instruct in all the truths necessary for salvation. Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. . . . We must, therefore, conclude that the Scriptures *alone* cannot be a sufficient guide and rule of faith, because they cannot, at any time, be within the reach of every inquirer; because they are not of themselves clear and intelligible even in matters of the highest importance; and because they do not contain all the truths necessary for salvation."—"*Faith of Our Fathers*," by Cardinal Gibbons, p. 111.

The following quotations will show what the Catholic Church teaches as to the authority for its doctrine:

"*Question*.—Has tradition any connection with the rule of faith?

"*Answer*.—Yes; because it is a part of God's revealed word, properly called the *unwritten* word, as the Scripture is called the *written* word.

"*Ques*.—What is tradition?

"*Ans*.—The doctrines which the apostles taught by word of mouth, and which have descended through every successive generation even to our times.

"*Ques*.—Are we obliged to believe what tradition teaches, equally with what is taught by Scripture?

"*Ans*.—Yes; we are obliged to believe the one as firmly as the other."—"*Doctrinal Catechism*," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, pp. 86, 87.

"Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine tradition contain the word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, tradition is to us more clear and safe."—Bruno's "*Catholic Belief*," p. 45.

How contrary this all is to the clear teachings of Jesus. In Mark 7:6-9 it is recorded that He said:

“Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. Howbeit in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And He said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.”

It is this leaving of the written and inspired word of God to follow the conflicting, confusing traditions of the ancients, that has repeatedly led the church into error and apostasy. If tradition is as good as the Bible, if the hearsay of what has been taught in past ages must be accepted, then there is no fixed standard of truth. The teachings of one church are as reliable as any other. But think of the confusion to which this leads us! Surely, it is worse than the confusion of languages at the tower of Babel. A thousand voices from as many religions and sects shout in our ears, “This is the way. The fathers believed thus and so.” And yet no two of them agree!

It may be truly said that the Bible and tradition are like two rivers, as stated above by Dr. Bruno, but while the Bible is the pure word of God, tradition is foul with error and sophistry. The Bible flows forth from the very throne of God, and its sparkling waters, which are clear as crystal, come down to us as the water of life. Those who drink deeply of it shall never thirst again. But the river of tradition has become polluted with the errors and commandments of men; its waters have been contaminated through the work of God’s great arch-enemy in his effort to deceive and destroy the faith of God’s children. The Lord Jesus Christ Himself, in the Scripture text above quoted, declares the commandment of God supreme above all human tradition. God’s will, expressed in the decalogue, cannot be set aside by any man-made ordinance.

Now it is, of course, known by everybody that Catholics all observe Sunday, the first day of the week, instead of Satur-

day, the seventh day, but their reason for doing this is clearly stated in their official catechisms. They do not claim to have Scriptural authority for this practice, but, on the contrary, they frankly and clearly say that there is no such authority, and that in this matter they are following tradition only.

Note carefully the following quotations bearing directly upon this point, from one of their recognized works:

“Question.—When Protestants do profane work upon Saturday, or the seventh day of the week, do they follow the Scripture as their only rule of faith,—do they find this permission clearly laid down in the Sacred Volume?

“Answer.—On the contrary, they have only the authority of tradition for this practice. In profaning Saturday, they violate one of God’s commandments, which He has never clearly abrogated,—‘Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day.’

“Ques.—Is the observance of Sunday, as the day of rest, a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

“Ans.—It certainly is not; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation. To say we observe the Sunday, because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture; and we might as well say that we should rest on Thursday because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.”—*“Doctrinal Catechism,” Rev. Stephen Keenan, p. 352.*

“Ques.—What do you conclude from all this?

“Ans.—That Protestants have no Scripture for the measure of their day of rest; that they abolish the observance of Saturday without warrant of Scripture; that they substitute Sunday in its place without Scriptural authority; consequently, that for all this, they have only traditional authority. . . . Hence we must conclude, that the Scripture, which does not teach these things clearly, does not contain all necessary truths, and, consequently, cannot be the only rule of faith.”—*Id., pp. 354, 355.*

So there we have it. That clearly states the Catholic position. Tradition is safer than the Bible. And it was on this platform that Mr. Canright took his stand in trying to prove Sunday sacredness. He found it only in tradition. And every individual must take his choice. Either his faith must be planted on the solid rock of Scriptural truth, the word that

liveth and abideth forever, or upon the quagmire of tradition. In the one are found the ten commandments, the Sabbath, and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ to enable us to keep them. In the other are apostasy, uncertainty, and shipwreck of faith. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." "Howbeit in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men." Mark 7:7, 8.

CHAPTER IX

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

FINDING in previous chapters that the Sabbath of the decalogue was never changed by divine authority, and yet knowing that most of the religious world today keep the first day of the week instead of the original seventh day, we are led to inquire, Who did change the Sabbath? How has this change been brought about? If the change was not made by Christ or His apostles, by whose authority was it made?

Seventh-day Adventists, since their rise, have claimed that the change was made by the great apostasy which headed up in Rome, through councils, prelates, and popes. This Mr. Canright stoutly denies.

He first claims very vehemently that "the change was made by the apostles." This he reiterates over and over in his latest book, "The Lord's Day," published in 1915. (See pages 83, 89-99.)

This error we have already completely answered. We have in a previous chapter studied every verse in the New Testament where the first day of the week is mentioned, and have found that not once is it called the Sabbath, the Lord's day, a holy day, or a day of rest. There is absolutely no mention of Sunday sacredness in all the New Testament. There is no suggestion from either Christ or the apostles that it was to take the place of the seventh-day Sabbath.

We are clearly told in the Gospels that the Sabbath comes between the sixth and the first days of the week (see Luke 23:54-56; 24:1); therefore it is the seventh day. We find Luke talking about the Sabbath "according to the command-

ment," and stating that the followers of Jesus kept it even after Christ's crucifixion. (See Luke 23:56.) Thus this companion of Paul, who wrote at least twenty-eight years after the cross, does not recognize any change as having taken place.

Mark declares that when the first day of the week comes, the Sabbath is past. (See Mark 16.)

This shows that Mark also did not recognize any change in the Sabbath obligation. John in Revelation 1:10 speaks of the Lord's day, but he does not hint that he was referring to Sunday. He merely says "the Lord's day," and both Jesus and inspired writers insist that the Lord's day is the original Sabbath. Thus through Isaiah God calls it "My holy day." Isa. 58:13. And Jesus declared, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. Can such a statement be produced in support of a Sunday Lord's day?—Absolutely not. If it had been there, Mr. Canright would have found it. The word of God is not divided against itself. It is not yea and nay, but yea and amen; that is, it is a harmonious whole. (See 2 Cor. 1:19, 20.) When it declares in one place that one day is the Lord's day, it does not contradict it in some other place and substitute another Lord's day. Therefore no Sunday Lord's day is to be found in Scripture.

But Mr. Canright himself reveals the fact that he was conscious of this weakness in his argument. He quotes from a Catholic author in support of the theory that the apostles changed the day, and yet he had formerly said:

"In commemoration of Christ's resurrection, the church observes Sunday. *The observance does not rest on any positive law, of which there is no trace.*"—"The Lord's Day," by D. M. Canright, p. 93.

So here we have the confession of utter failure. There is no trace of a law for Sunday keeping in Holy Scripture. It does not therefore rest upon divine authority, and we must of necessity look elsewhere to ascertain its origin.

DID THE GREEK CHURCH CHANGE THE SABBATH?

Upon utterly failing to prove the theory that the apostles changed the Sabbath, Mr. Canright moves to an entirely new platform and boldly declares:

“Sunday observance originated with the Eastern or Greek Church, not with Rome in the West.” “The proof of this is abundant.”—*Id.*, p. 165.

And again:

“All the first witnesses for the Lord’s day were not Romans, but Greeks living in the East.”—*Id.*, p. 167.

Now this is certainly a most important admission. Mr. Canright made it in an attempt to disprove the claim that the Roman Church changed the day, but he has proved too much. In fact, he has given his case entirely away. Seventh-day Adventists have always claimed that the Sabbath was changed by human and not divine authority, and here we have a full admission of this fact by Mr. Canright. The only difference now left between his position and that of the Seventh-day Adventists, is that he tries to differentiate between actions of the churches in the East and those in the West. He claims that it was not the church at Rome or any of the Western Catholic churches that did the changing of the Sabbath, but that it was the Greek Catholic churches in the East. So says Mr. Canright.

Suppose for the moment that we admit this sharp distinction between the actions of these branches of the early Catholic Church,—that the Greek Catholic Church in the East was entirely responsible for the change. What have we now? Why, in Sunday we have a Greek Catholic sabbath instead of a Roman Catholic sabbath. And may we inquire what advantage we have thus gained? Is a Greek Catholic sabbath better in any particular than a Roman Catholic sabbath? Did the churches in the East have greater authority to tamper with God’s law than did the churches in the West? How is this?

So long as the change was not made upon Scriptural authority, but by human organizations after the days of Christ and His apostles, what binding claim can this new Sunday rest day have upon Christians, even if it did come from the Greeks instead of the Romans? The really important consideration is that it originated with man, and not with God.

But let us note the dilemma in which Mr. Canright has placed himself. Says he:

"The change was made by the apostles."—*Id.*, p. 83.

Then he says:

"Sunday observance originated with the Eastern, or Greek, Church, not with Rome in the West."—*Id.*, p. 165.

Now we ask, How can both of these statements be true? If the change was made by the apostles, how could Sunday observance have originated with the Greeks? Were the twelve apostles Greeks? Not one of them. They were all Jews. It was not until after every ordinance of the Christian church had been instituted and placed in order; not until the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord, which ratified the new covenant; not, in fact, until Pentecost that the gospel began to be proclaimed to the Greeks and other Gentile nations. In fact, Mr. Canright refers to Pentecost to show that the Greeks heard the gospel upon that occasion, and carried it to the countries in the East. (See "The Lord's Day," by D. M. Canright, p. 166.)

But what has this to do with the Sabbath? The early church was already established, its laws and ordinances were fixed, it had been given its commission to "Go, . . . teach all nations," and the teaching was to lead people "to observe all things whatsoever I [Jesus] have commanded you." Matt. 28: 19, 20. The commands had been given, and with Peter's sermon on Pentecost the apostolic church, under the endowment of the Holy Spirit, entered upon its Heaven-appointed task of world evangelism. Any change of laws or ordinances after

that would be invalid. It had not been left for Gentile converts of later centuries to make the rules and laws of the church, but Christ had carefully attended to all this Himself, and had given His disciples full instruction as to what to teach. Concerning the ten commandments He had said to them: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail;" and "whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Luke 16:17; Matt. 5:19. This, then, included the Sabbath and all, every tittle. This is as though Jesus had said that not so much as the dot of an "i" or the cross of a "t" was to fail or be changed. And the disciples are commanded to both *do* and *teach* them. Thus the commission given by our Lord to the church to "teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," included the teaching of the whole of the decalogue. Any subsequent change in the Sabbath, by either Greek or Roman, could therefore in no way alter our obligation to keep the original Sabbath of creation.

Let us carefully note Mr. Canright's statement already quoted:

"All the first witnesses for the Lord's day were not Romans, but Greeks living in the East. These were Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Dionysius, Clement, Anatolius, Origen, Eusebius, etc."—*The Lord's Day,* p. 167.

Let the reader carefully note this candid admission. Why does he not cite Christ, Paul, Peter, James, John, Matthew, and the other apostles and New Testament writers, as the "first witnesses for the Lord's day"? Simply because the apostles knew nothing of a Sunday Lord's day, and therefore could not bear witness to it. No such thing as substituting Sunday for Saturday, the original seventh-day Sabbath, had been thought of in their day. All this change followed later, in the wake of the apostasy which engulfed Christendom during the Middle Ages, and Mr. Canright here frankly admits that he has to turn to the church Fathers of these medieval times,

when the church had departed from the apostolic faith, to find the first witnesses for his Sunday Lord's day. But Mr. Canright's witnesses have come upon the stand a few centuries too late, and their testimony cannot be admitted as evidence by the true disciple of Christ.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH WAS KEPT FOR SEVERAL
CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA BY
THE ENTIRE CHURCH

Now, it is some time subsequent to the time of the apostles that we must look for the change from Sabbath to Sunday observance. We must find it in history, since it cannot be found in Scripture. As the canon of Scripture closes with the Revelation, we are left without any record whatsoever of a change. It had not therefore taken place up to that time. It was altogether a later development, and came in as a perversion of the teachings of Christ and the apostles.

The first recorded instance of religious meetings being held by some of the Christian churches on Sunday, which has any claim to be considered genuine, is mentioned by Justin Martyr, 140 A. D., when some Christians met and read the writings of the apostles. Justin does not, however, even intimate that this day had any divine authority, either from Christ or from His apostles. Nor was it kept as a day of rest. It was about this time, however, that the great apostasy began to develop, which was foretold by the apostle Paul in the following scriptures:

"I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29, 30.

Again:

"The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4:3, 4.

And yet again:

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

This apostasy, which was already working in Paul's day, soon began to play havoc with the church. The pagan Romans who nominally accepted Christianity, generally remained unchanged at heart, and in a short time they began to remodel the religion of the apostles. The Baptist historian Robinson says:

"Toward the latter end of the second century, most of the churches assumed a new form; the first simplicity disappeared; and insensibly, as the old disciples retired to their graves, their children came forward, and new-molded the cause."—*Ecclesiastical Researches*," chap. 6, p. 51.

It was a number of centuries, however, before the Sabbath began to be superseded by Sunday as a day of rest from labor. On this point the historian Coleman says:

"Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church."—*Ancient Christianity Exemplified*," chap. 26, sec. 2, p. 527.

In the same chapter he also says:

"During the early ages of the church, it [Sunday] was never entitled 'the Sabbath,' this word being confined to the seventh day of the week."

Dr. T. H. Morer (Church of England) also makes this statement:

"The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted that they derived this practice from the apostles themselves, as appears by several scriptures to that purpose."—*Dialogues on the Lord's Day*," p. 189.

H. C. Haggveit (Lutheran) bears the following testimony:

"For the first five centuries of the church there is no mention of any transfer or change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week."—*Church History*, p. 79. Chicago, 1898.

Neander, one of the greatest of church historians, says:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect,—far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday."—*The History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. I, p. 186, translated by Henry John Rose, B. D.

HOW SUNDAY LATER CREPT INTO THE CHURCH

Early in the Christian era a new form of heathen worship sprang up and spread rapidly throughout the then Gentile world. It was known as "Mithraism," and had to do with the worship of the sun, as did other forms of heathenism; but its philosophy was more fascinating than the more crude form of paganism, and made a pretense of holding up high standards of morality. This new heathenism soon captured the Cæsars, invaded the Roman armies and the centers of learning, and was embraced by the higher classes of society. Alexandria and Rome soon became important Mithran centers, and, in fact, history records that in "the middle of the third century Mithraism seemed on the verge of becoming the universal religion," and that it "became the greatest antagonist of Christianity." Some of the peculiar doctrines enunciated by its priests were "the immortality of the soul," "the use of bell and candle, holy water and communion; sanctification of Sunday and the 25th of December."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th edition, art. "Mithras."

"The devotees of Mithra held Sunday sacred because Mithra was identified with the 'invincible sun.'"—*Letter to C. P. Bollman from W. de C. Ravenel, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary*

of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., quoted in "Sunday," p. 3.

Franz Cumont, Ph. D., LL. D., speaking of Mithraists, says:

"They held Sunday sacred, and celebrated the birth of the Sun on the 25th of December."—"The Mysteries of Mithra," 1910, pp. 190, 191.

There soon set in a life-and-death struggle between Mithraism and Christianity, and since apostasy was already rife in the Christian church, it was only a short step farther for her leaders to agree upon a compromise. Many of these leaders had themselves come into the church as converts from Mithraism, and still had a certain veneration for the sun and those institutions held sacred to it. It was therefore agreed by them that, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen, and thus advance the cause of Christ over that of Mithra, they would incorporate many of the teachings and institutions of Mithraism into the church, and among these was the Sunday festival.

On this point we have the following striking testimony of the *Catholic World*, published in 1894:

"The church took the pagan philosophy and made it the buckler of faith against the heathen. She took the pagan Roman Pantheon, temple of all the gods, and made it sacred to all the martyrs; so it stands to this day. She took the pagan Sunday and made it the Christian Sunday. She took the pagan Easter and made it the feast we celebrate during this season. . . .

"The sun was a foremost god with heathendom. . . . There is, in truth, something royal, kingly about the sun, making it a fit emblem of Jesus, the Sun of justice. Hence the church in these countries would seem to have said, 'Keep that old pagan name. It shall remain consecrated, sanctified.' And thus the pagan Sunday, dedicated to Balder [the god of light and peace], became the Christian Sunday, sacred to Jesus."—*The Catholic World*, Vol. 58, No. 348, March, 1894, p. 809.

Morer, an English Churchman, says:

"The Christians thought fit to keep the same day and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by

that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles, and bring a greater prejudice than might otherwise be taken against the gospel."—*Dialogues on the Lord's Day,* p. 23.

Rev. William Frederick declares:

"The Gentiles were an idolatrous people who worshiped the sun, and Sunday was their most sacred day. Now, in order to reach the people in this new field, it seems but natural, as well as necessary, to make Sunday the rest day of the church. . . . At this time it became necessary for the church to either adopt the Gentiles' day or else have the Gentiles change their day. To change the Gentiles' day would have been an offense and a stumblingblock to them. The church could naturally reach them better by keeping their day. . . . There was no need in causing an unnecessary offense by dishonoring their day."—*Three Prophetic Days, or Sunday the Christian's Sabbath,* pp. 169, 170.

With the celebration of Sunday came the worship toward the east in the early morning hour, at the rising of the sun, and Christianity came so nearly to resemble the religion of the heathen world that many of its adherents were no longer able to distinguish between the two. Dr. Franz Cumont tells us in the following passage how that which should have been rendered to God was now often rendered to the dazzling sun:

"On the other hand, the ecclesiastical writers . . . contrasted the 'Sun of justice' with the 'invincible sun,' and consented to see in the dazzling orb which illuminated man a symbol of Christ, 'the light of the world.' Should we be astonished if the multitudes of devotees failed always to observe the subtle distinctions of the doctors, and if in obedience to a pagan custom they rendered to the radiant star of the day the homage which orthodoxy reserved for God? In the fifth century, not only heretics, but even faithful followers were still wont to bow their heads toward its dazzling disc as it rose above the horizon, and to murmur the prayer, 'Have mercy on us.'"—*Mysteries of Mithra,* p. 193.

Christianity finally came to look just like paganism. Faustus, a pagan of the fourth century, in speaking to the Christians, declared:

"You celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, . . . and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them."—*Faustus (a non-Christian) to*

St. Augustine (4th Century); cited in "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," John William Draper. M. D., LL. D., Vol. I, p. 310.

"The Christian church made no formal but a gradual and almost unconscious transference of the one day to the other."—"The Voice From Sinai," Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, p. 167, ed. 1892.

Dr. Peter Heylyn (Church of England):

"It was near 900 years from our Saviour's birth, if not quite so much, before restraint of husbandry on this day, had been first thought of in the *East*; and probably being thus restrained, did find no more obedience there, than it had done before in the Western parts."—"History of the Sabbath," part 2, chap. 5, par. 6.

Bishop Grimelund of Norway:

"Now, summing up what history teaches regarding the origin of Sunday and the development of the doctrine about Sunday, then this is the sum: It is *not* the apostles, *not* the early Christians, *nor* the councils of the ancient church which have imprinted the name and stamp of the Sabbath upon the Sunday, but it is the Church of the Middle Ages and its scholastic teachers."—"Søndagens Historie," p. 37.

"Bear in mind that the substitution [of the first for the seventh day] was not a coerced happening; it could not be a sudden, but only a very slow development, probably never anticipated, never even designed or put into shape by those chiefly interested, but creeping almost unconsciously into being."—"A Day for Rest and Worship," William B. Dana, p. 174.

CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY LAW

Thus a gradual change from Sabbath observance to Sunday observance came in after the first centuries of the Christian era had passed, especially among the Western churches. The more the pagan world came to favor Christianity, and the farther removed the church became from the influence of the apostolic example of the first century, the more Sunday observance and the other heathen festivals prevailed. This change, covering centuries, was greatly helped by Constantine's civil law of 321 in favor of the first day of the week, which banned work upon that day in the cities, and commanded the people to rest on "the venerable day of the sun." This famous decree

said nothing about the "Lord's day," but was promulgated apparently for the purpose of finally establishing a heathen festival. This law of Constantine's is quoted in the old Chambers's Encyclopedia, in its article "Sabbath," as follows:

"Let all judges, inhabitants of the cities, and artificers, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But in the country, husbandmen may freely and lawfully apply to the business of agriculture; since it often happens that the sowing of corn and the planting of vines cannot be so advantageously performed on any other day."

"But it was not until the year 538 that abstinence from agricultural labor was recommended, rather than enjoined, by an ecclesiastical authority (the third Council of Orleans), and this expressly that people might have more leisure to go to church and say their prayers."

The Encyclopedia Britannica says:

"The earliest recognition of the observance of Sunday as a legal duty is a constitution of Constantine in 321 A. D., enacting that all courts of justice, inhabitants of towns, and workshops were to be at rest on Sunday (*venerabili die solis*), with an exception in favor of those engaged in agricultural labor."—*Art. "Sunday," Vol. XXVI, 11th Ed., p. 95.*

Robert Cox says:

"He [Grotius] refers to Eusebius for proof that Constantine, besides issuing his well-known edict that labor should be suspended on Sunday, enacted that the people should not be brought before the law courts on the seventh day of the week, which also, he adds, was long observed by the primitive Christians as a day for religious meetings. And this, says he, 'refutes those who think that the Lord's day [Sunday] was substituted for the Sabbath—a thing nowhere mentioned either by Christ or His apostles.'"—*Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), "Opera Omnia Theologica." London, 1679. Cited in "The Literature of the Sabbath Question," Robert Cox, Vol. I, p. 223.*

This, then, is admittedly the very first law for the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, and it is made, not by "the Lord from heaven," our one and only Lawgiver, but by Emperor Constantine, who was of questionable character, and whose sympathies were more with paganism than with Christianity. Even this was not an ecclesiastical law of the church at that time, but merely a civil law made by the ruling

emperor, and it was made in the fourth century after Christ, too late, it seems to us, to deserve any recognition from Christians as establishing a Christian institution which they are bound, under penalty of sin, to recognize; and, besides, it comes from a very questionable source.

The fact seems to be that Constantine's law for Sunday observance was not made for the purpose of favoring and establishing a Christian day of worship at all, but to enforce a pagan festival upon Christians and pagans alike, Mr. Canright's argument to the contrary notwithstanding. Thus his law, instead of commanding rest upon "the Lord's day," commands it "*on the venerable day of the sun.*" He did not recognize Sunday as a Christian ordinance, but as a day sacred to the sun god worshiped by the pagan world. It was the holy day of Mithraism, the great rival of Christianity. His law, therefore, was not for the purpose of enforcing Christianity upon the pagans under his jurisdiction, but of enforcing the new paganism upon the Christians.

In his book, "The Lord's Day," Mr. Canright makes a long, labored effort to prove that Constantine had become a Christian convert some years before the promulgation of this famous Sunday law, and that he was therefore enforcing Sunday rest as a Christian ordinance, and not as a heathen festival. Now there is one difficulty here. When Constantine made his law, it was to the effect that people were to "rest on *the venerable day of the sun,*" not on the Sunday—Lord's day. Does this indicate that he was enforcing a Christian Sabbath? The answer is clear. The emperor was enjoining upon Christians and pagans alike the festival of the sun god, and was thereby legalizing sun worship and making it a civil crime for Christians to work upon Sunday, as thousands were still doing up to this time. It was an effort to enforce heathen practices upon the Christian church.

Mr. Canright admits that when Constantine made his famous Sunday law, he was still ordering that sacrifices be

made to pagan gods, and that he had pagan rites performed for himself, but asserts that he was doing this, not from choice, but to avoid a rebellion among his pagan subjects. (See "The Lord's Day," by D. M. Canright, p. 197.) But how can it be demonstrated that this was his motive? The admitted fact is that he was still a heathen, and that when he made a law enforcing Sunday rest, he chose a pagan title for the day, boldly calling it "the venerable day of the *sun*," not the day of the *Son*, or Lord.

As to whether Constantine was here seeking to enforce a heathen or a Christian festival, Professor Webster makes the following pertinent statement:

"This legislation by Constantine probably bore no relation to Christianity; it appears, on the contrary, that the emperor, in his capacity of Pontifex Maximus, was only adding the day of the sun, the worship of which was then firmly established in the Roman Empire, to the other ferial days of the sacred calendar."—"Rest Days," Prof. Hutton Webster, Ph. D. (*University of Nebraska*), p. 122.

"What began, however, as a pagan ordinance, ended as a Christian regulation; and a long series of imperial decrees, during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, enjoined with increasing stringency abstinence from labor on Sunday."—*Id.*, p. 270.

Dean Stanley declares:

"The retention of the old pagan name 'Dies Solis,' or 'Sunday,' for the weekly Christian festival, is, in great measure, owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution."—"Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church," Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D., lecture 6, par. 15, p. 184.

And from Philip Schaff we quote:

"The Sunday law of Constantine must not be overrated. . . . There is no reference whatever in his law either to the fourth commandment or to the resurrection of Christ. Besides, he expressly exempted the country districts, where paganism still prevailed, from the prohibition of labor. . . . Christians and pagans had been accustomed to festival rests; *Constantine* made these rests

to synchronize, and gave the preference to Sunday.”—“*History of the Christian Church*,” Philip Schaff. *Third Period, chap. 7, sec. 75* (Vol. III, p. 380).

But suppose Constantine had been a Christian when he made his Sunday law, and that he did it to establish a Christian sabbath. Would that prove anything for its sacredness? Was this Roman emperor, who, according to Mr. Canright, was still sacrificing to heathen deities, a suitable founder of the Christian religion? Was he among the prophets called of God to deliver His oracles to His people? Was his authority above that of Christ and the apostles? Does God’s rest day require such props to hold it up? Is not this very effort thus to bolster up the Sunday rest day an admission of the weakness of the claims made for it?

If a single text of Scripture in favor of Sunday observance could have been found, how totally unnecessary would be all this effort to prove Constantine to have been a great benefactor to the Christian church! The Sabbath law is found in the word of God. Failing to find a Sunday law there, Mr. Canright resorts to the edict of a half Christian, half pagan emperor of the fourth century. The Sabbath was given at creation, spoken by God on Sinai, observed by patriarchs and prophets, and kept by Christ and the apostles to the very close of New Testament times. Sunday came in later. The earliest trace Mr. Canright can find of it is in the second century.

People in that century were saying the apostles changed it, but they offered no proof. No word of Christ or apostle is ever quoted by them on this point. The testimony of Scripture is silent on the subject of Sunday sacredness—not a word about it. There is not an instance of observance. Had there been such a word spoken, Mr. Canright would certainly have built his argument upon it, instead of trying to bolster it up with this Sunday law of Constantine, who he admits was still head of the heathen religion when his Sunday law was enacted. Mr. Canright cites certain texts where he thinks perhaps Sun-

day is alluded to, but later frankly admits that they do not furnish a real record of a change. For such a record he has to go to his Christian-heathen emperor, Constantine, and there too he is disappointed, because this man, unfortunately, referred to Sunday by using its pagan name instead of calling it the Lord's day. It seems to us that Mr. Canright's Lord's day argument is built upon a sandy foundation.

We believe that the above historical quotations constitute a complete answer to Mr. Canright's declaration that the pagans did not regard Sunday as a festival on which they worshiped the sun god. The first day of the week was known throughout the pagan world as the sun's day. The name given to it was "Dies Solis," or the day of the sun, sacred to the sun god. The Religious Encyclopedia says:

"The Ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun."

According to this, the title originated in heathen idolatry. Do authorities agree upon this? Yes; there is not a recognized author in all the rounds of history or literature who dissents from this. One author says:

"The heathen nations in the north of Europe dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday. Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun."

Turning to Webster's New International Dictionary we find the same thought briefly expressed as follows:

"Sunday: so named because anciently dedicated to the sun or its worship."

These authors give an ancient origin to the name. Constantine was not the originator of the title which he gave to the day. Another writer, Morer, says:

"It is not to be denied but [that] we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him."

Thus it is shown that Constantine probably had no thought of enforcing respect for a Christian institution by his famous Sunday law, but rather a very ancient heathen festival, which was then beginning to compete strongly with the Christian Sabbath (Saturday). This resulted from the influence of paganism upon the Christian church.

Of the popularity of sun worship at Rome at that time, and the consequent influence this had upon the Christian religion, the following historical quotations will testify:

"Sun worship, however, became increasingly popular at Rome in the second and third centuries A. D. The sun god of Emesa in Syria—*Deus Sol invictus Elagabalus*—was exalted above the older gods of Rome by the emperor [Macrinus, A. D. 217, taking the name Elagabalus], who, as his priest, was identified with the object of his worship; and in spite of the disgust inspired by the excesses of the boy priest, an impulse was given to the spread of a kind of 'solar pantheism,' which embraced by a process of syncretism the various Oriental religions and was made the chief worship of the state by Aurelian."—*Companion to Roman History*," H. Stuart Jones, p. 302.

Milman says:

"It was openly asserted that the worship of the sun, under his name of Elagabalus, was to supersede all other worship."—*The History of Christianity*," Henry Hart Milman, book 2, chap. 8, par. 22.

Professor Hutton Webster calls Sunday a pagan institution which was engrafted onto Christianity:

"The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week, with its numbered week days, but by the close of the third century A. D. this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism. . . . During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worship, especially that of '*Mithra*,' in the Roman world, had already led to the substitution by pagans of *dies Solis* for *dies Saturni*, as the first day of the planetary week. . . . Thus gradually a pagan institution was engrafted on Christianity."—*Rest Days*," Prof. Hutton Webster, pp. 220, 221.

Dean Milman tells how the Emperor Elagabalus tried to unify all the religions into one great system of heathenism:

"If we may believe the biographies in the Augustine history, a more ambitious scheme of a universal religion had dawned upon the mind of the emperor [Elagabalus (201-222), son of the senator Varius Marcellus]. The Jewish, the Samaritan, even the Christian, were to be fused and recast into one great system, of which the sun was to be the central object of adoration."—*The History of Christianity*, Dean Henry Hart Milman, book 2, chap. 8, par. 20.

We now quote in this connection an amazing confession by Dr. Hiscox, author of the "Baptist Manual," in which he also admits that Sunday came into the church from paganism:

"Of course, I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian Fathers and other sources. But what a pity that it comes branded with the mark of paganism, and christened with the name of the sun god, when adopted and sanctioned by the papal apostasy, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism!"—*Dr. Edward T. Hiscox, author of "The Baptist Manual," in a paper read before a New York City Ministers' Conference, held in New York City, Nov. 13, 1893.*

On this point Mr. Canright, writing in 1885, before he had renounced his faith in the Bible Sabbath, truly said:

"Now it is a very common error to suppose that a practice which is very old, and can be traced back to somewhere near the apostolic church, must be correct. But this is an evident mistake, for apostasy commenced so early that there is no safety in accepting tradition on any subject. Our only safety is the Scriptures themselves. Protestants claim to rely wholly on this authority, leaving tradition to Catholics; and yet, on this subject, as well as some others, they follow Rome, because the Bible gives them no help. . . .

"Now the question arises, Just when did the practice of Sunday keeping commence? No one can tell exactly. Why? If the change had been made by divine authority, we could put our finger on the exact point, and show where it was done. But, like all error, its introduction was gradual. You cannot follow a river into the ocean, and put your finger down and say, There, just at that spot the fresh water stops and the salt water begins; neither can you tell where Sabbath keeping stopped and Sunday observance began, as there was a gradual mingling of truth and error.

"You will hear men say with all confidence that, while the seventh day was kept to the crucifixion, the practice of the church

since then has been unanimous in keeping the first day. I do not see how a man can be honest and say this, unless he is very ignorant, as the most trustworthy historians . . . testify to the contrary. . . .

"When it [Sunday] was introduced, it did not come in as a sabbath. Look at the word itself, 'Sunday.' Webster defines it as 'so-called, because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun;' and the *North British Review* styles it 'the wild solar holiday of all pagan times.' Now, how did it creep into the church? I'll tell you how. When the early Christians evangelized the heathen tribes, they would go to the head, or chief, and labor with him to convince him of the superiority of the Christian religion. If he became convinced, he would command his entire tribe to be baptized. They were pagans, and had kept Sunday as a festival in honor of one of their gods, the sun; and when they outwardly accepted Christianity, they kept up their observance of Sunday, which gradually supplanted the Lord's Sabbath. And while some of these might have been soundly converted, there is evidence to show that though the Sabbath was kept, Sunday was also observed as a kind of holiday, but with no idea of sacredness attached to it. . . .

"And so we might trace the history down through the first centuries. The observance of Sunday, introduced as a holiday, or festival, gradually assumed more importance as a rival of God's Sabbath, until, by the influx of half-converted pagans into the church, bringing with them their *solar holiday*, it began to supplant its divinely appointed rival. . . . It was not until the Council of Orleans, 538 A. D., that Sunday labor in the country was prohibited, and thus, as Dr. Paley remarked, it became 'an institution of the church,' and of that church into whose hands the saints, times, and laws were to be given for 1260 years; and it may be something more than a coincidence that 538 A. D. was the beginning of that period."—"*Tabernacle Lectures*," *Lecture Ten*, by D. M. Canright, pp. 76-83.

J. N. Andrews, author of "The History of the Sabbath," tells us how Constantine was really responsible for laying the foundations of the Papacy. We quote two paragraphs from him:

"Bower minutely details the order of the hierarchy, its divisions, and the orders of its officers, as established by Constantine, making it an ecclesiastical government closely modeled after the civil. Although the exarchs and metropolitan bishops were over all the bishops in their dioceses and provinces, there was no one bishop over all. Yet it was declared by the Council of Nice that the primacy should rest in the bishop of Rome, in honor of that city.

The title was then an empty one, except in the honor of the name; but it became fruitful both of dignity and power. *The bishop of Rome soon became the representative of the faith of the church.* To be in harmony with Rome was to be orthodox; disagreement with Rome was heresy. . . .

"A certain writer well observed that Constantine would have proved himself a noble ruler if he had rested with the acts of toleration of Christianity; but he followed this up with acts of intolerance against all Christians but those who happened to enjoy his favor, who composed that party which could best serve the interests of the empire. This party, of course, was represented by the bishop of Rome; for it would have been absurd to think of best serving the empire by conferring the primacy on any bishop but that of the imperial city. It was Constantine who convened the Council of Nice, where the famous creed of the church was formed. Thus was laid the foundation of the Papacy, or papal hierarchy."—*Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists,* 1895, pp. 148, 149.

LED BY ROME, THE CHURCH MAKES LAWS FAVORING SUNDAY

It was not long after Constantine's civil law for Sunday observance was promulgated until the church, through its councils, bishops, and popes, began to make religious laws in favor of Sunday. The church was by now in an almost complete state of apostasy. The rites and ceremonies of the pagan religions had almost wholly taken the place of the commands of God and the ordinances of the New Testament. The doctrine of the conscious state of the dead, witchcraft, spiritism, sprinkling for baptism, infant baptism, etc., were being embraced. Soon the mass was substituted for the Lord's supper; Mary for Jesus, as mediator between God and man; human priests usurped the position of Christ as our High Priest; the confessional was established, and the Papacy was well under way, though it had not yet reached the zenith of its power. The crowning act in all this apostasy was the changing of the Sabbath, substituting by church authority the pagan festival of Sunday for the Christian Sabbath, Saturday. This the church began to enforce by edict.

The first *ecclesiastical* law for Sunday observance recorded in history is that of the Council of Laodicea, held about the year 364. The pronouncement of the council was:

“Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Sabbath, original], but shall work on that day; but the Lord’s day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.”—*A History of the Church Councils*,” Rt. Rev. Charles Joseph Hefele, D. D., Bishop of Rotenburg, book 6, sec. 93, canon 29 (Vol. II, p. 316).

The canons of this council were adopted by the churches, and have always been accepted as Catholic. This was a church council, an ecclesiastical congress. What it did was representative of the Catholic Church. Did it do anything toward changing the Sabbath? It did. It required Christians to rest on the Lord’s day, meaning Sunday, and prohibited them from resting on the Bible Sabbath (Saturday), under penalty of being accursed of Christ. Than this the church could pronounce no severer penalty. The command of the council was absolute. People were peremptorily ordered to rest on Sunday and to work on Saturday. The very fact that the order was given proves beyond all possible doubt that at least a large section of the Christian church still kept the Bible Sabbath, Saturday, and this canon (29) of Laodicea was given in an effort to change this practice, or, in other words, *to change the Sabbath*.

Mr. Canright says:

“We have given plenty of proof that Sunday was observed by all Christians as early at least as 140 A. D., or nearly two hundred years before even the foundation of the Papacy was laid.”—*The Lord’s Day*,” by D. M. Canright, p. 221.

Does it not, then, strike the reader as passing strange that a church council held in 364 A. D. should be making laws to enforce upon its members a custom which had been universally observed by them for over two hundred years? Why should the Council of Laodicea have wasted time legislating about

people's keeping the Sabbath when no one had kept it since 140 A. D.?

In order to get over this point, Mr. Canright is forced to admit that there were those who were still keeping the Sabbath, but he brands them as heretics, and tries to make it appear that they were a small minority. (See "The Lord's Day," by D. M. Canright, p. 217.)

But we have only the statement of Mr. Canright himself that the Sabbath observers were the real heretics and were in the minority. We have already furnished abundant proof that the Sabbath was still observed very largely by the church, but that through the influence of thousands of converts from paganism, its sanctity was now diminishing and the day of the sun was rapidly supplanting it. The fact, however, which even Mr. Canright must admit, that there were Christians even in the fourth century who still persisted in the observance of the Sabbath and who had to be suppressed in this matter by an action of a church council, entirely disproves his statement that Sunday was observed by *all* Christians as early as 140 A. D. It also further proves that the then Christian world had no clear knowledge of any change having been made in the Sabbath by divine command. Nor does the Laodicean Council invoke a command of Christ or the apostles when it thus takes its first action favoring Sunday observance, but it issues the command purely upon its own authority.

It was therefore the voice of a church in apostasy, influenced by the multitudes who had newly come to her from the heathen world and whose sympathies were still largely with the tenets of their former religion, who thus promulgated the first ecclesiastical law for Sunday keeping.

They made no claim whatsoever that their enforcement of Sunday was in any way based upon Scriptural authority. Whether it was or was not in harmony with Biblical testimony seems not to have concerned them in the least. They had set out to re-form the Christian religion, and the former heathen

festival of Sunday was to become the new Sabbath rest. That was all.

Now this one action of one Catholic council would not have been sufficient completely to reverse the practices of the entire church in all parts of the world where the Sabbath was still kept, *but it did constitute the first official utterance by the church in that direction*, and instead of repudiating what was done at Laodicea, later councils have invariably upheld it. The sixty-four articles adopted by that council are today practically a part of the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church.

It was the churches in the West—Rome, Alexandria, etc.—that took the lead in swinging entirely over from Sabbath to Sunday observance, and as Rome rose in power and prestige among the churches, she began a relentless effort to enforce this new doctrine upon all the churches. On this point we have the testimony of Sozomen and Socrates.

Sozomen says:

“The people of Constantinople, and of several other cities, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the next day; which custom is never observed at Rome, or at Alexandria.”—*“Ecclesiastical History,” Sozomen, from 324-440 A. D., book 7, chap. 19, p. 355.*

Socrates was born about 380 A. D., and lived during the time when the first attempts were made by the bishop of Rome to suppress the Sabbath. He had traveled over a considerable part of Christendom, and spoke of the church in general from personal knowledge. He said:

“Almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient traditions, refuse to do this.”—*“Ecclesiastical History,” Socrates, book 5, chap. 22, p. 404.*

It was the church at Rome, therefore, that took the lead in authoritatively substituting the papal Sunday for the Christian Sabbath. Many of the churches in the East, however, soon followed its example. At the Laodicean Council began the long struggle to enforce its observance upon all. Thereafter

everything was done that "Christian" emperors, kings, popes, councils, and synods could do to swing all the churches, both east and west, into line, to uphold the canon of Laodicea, and to add to the sanctity of the day of the sun. Charlemagne did more, perhaps, than any other emperor to make this part of the faith of the church effective, and in his first decree he referred directly to this canon of the Council of Laodicea. But it required repeated councils, actions, bulls, and encyclicals of the bishops and popes finally to establish the change. Yes, more still, it required bitter persecution, and a large number of those who refused to surrender their observance of the true Sabbath upon the mere authority of the church, had the privilege of sealing their faith with the blood of martyrdom.

In the time of Constantine, Bishop Sylvester ordained that Sunday should be called the Lord's day.

Pope Leo I, of the fifth century, in his letter No. 19, written to the bishop of Alexandria, commanded that even the consecration of priests should be performed on Sunday instead of the Sabbath, setting forth reasons why Sunday was the more fitting day for this sacred work. We quote the following passage from this letter, which has become famous in religious literature:

"For this reason you will observe the apostolic institutions in a devout and commendable way, when you observe this rule in the ordination of priests, in the churches over which the Lord has made you overseer; namely, that the one to be ordained receives the consecration solely and only on the day of the resurrection of the Lord, which, as you know, begins from the evening of the Sabbath, and is made sacred by so many divine mysteries, that whatever of greater prominence was commanded by the Lord, took place on this exalted day. On this day the world had its beginning; on it, through the resurrection of Christ, death found its end and life its beginning [9 Decret. cf. D. LXXV. c. 5]; on it the apostles received their commission from the Lord to proclaim the gospel to all nations, and to dispense to the entire world the sacrament of the regeneration. On it, as the holy evangelist John testifies, the Lord, after He had joined the assembled disciples by closed doors, breathed upon them and said: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they

are retained.' On this day, finally, came the Holy Spirit, which the Lord had promised to the apostles in order that we might recognize, as it were, inculcated and taught by a divine [heavenly] rule, *that we are to undertake on that day the mysteries of the priestly consecration*, on which all gifts and graces were imparted."—*Leo's Letters, from Letters of the Popes, No. 9, German edition.*

The first religious council to urge refraining from labor in the rural districts in the Western Empire was that of Orleans, 538 A. D., and the reason given for this was that it might be possible for the people to attend the services of the church upon that day.

There was no such specific law covering this point in the Eastern Empire until the decree of Emperor Leo VI, called the philosopher, near the close of the ninth century. From this decree we quote the following passage:

"We ordain, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles thereby directed, that on the sacred day [meaning Sunday] wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and surcease labor; that neither husbandmen nor other on that day put their hands to forbidden works."—*Quoted in "The Literature of the Sabbath Question," by Robert Cox, Vol. I, p. 422.*

Bishop Skat Rordam, of Denmark, clearly states that the change was made by the church under the Roman pope, its head. Note the following from his pen:

"As to when and how it became customary to keep the first day of the week the New Testament gives us no information. . . .

"The first law about it was given by Constantine the Great, who in the year 321 ordained that all civil and shop work should cease in the cities, but agricultural labor in the country was allowed. . . . But no one thought of basing this command to rest from labor on the third [fourth] commandment before the latter half of the sixth century. From that time on, little by little, it became the established doctrine of the church which was in force all through the Middle Ages during the 'Dark Ages of the Church,' that 'the holy church and its teachers,' or the bishops with the Roman pope at their head, as the vicar of Christ and His apostles on earth, had transferred the Old Testament Sabbath with its glory and sanctity over to the first day of the week."—*"Report of the Second Ecclesiastical Meeting in Copenhagen, Sept. 13-15, 1887," by P. Taaning, Copenhagen, 1887, pp. 40, 41.*

DID THE POPES CHANGE THE SABBATH?

But is it correct to say that the Sabbath was changed by the popes? was it not rather by church councils and the edicts of emperors? Mr. Canright scoffs at the idea, and tauntingly asks, Which pope? We reply that the actions of any council or any number of councils could not have established the canon law of the church without the full approval of the bishops and popes. Had the Council of Laodicea not later been, either officially or otherwise, approved by the church hierarchy, its canons never could have been taken almost bodily into the canon law and preserved there until the present day. To make any doctrine really Catholic it must have the approval of the popes.

The pope is not only a man elevated by vote of the cardinals to be the visible head of the Catholic Church, but he is the very embodiment of the whole papal system, the name itself being derived from the office. "Papal, of or pertaining to the pope."—*Webster*. It follows that what the Papacy does the pope does; and the acts of the Papacy may very properly be attributed to the pope. When we speak of Pharaoh as the oppressor of the children of Israel, we do not think of any particular ruler; in fact, we have every reason to believe that there was more than one. We think rather of the whole government of Egypt represented by Pharaoh. Similarly, when we speak of the pope, we do not necessarily think of one particular pope, but of the whole order of popes, and of the organization represented by the popes.

On this point we have the following terse statements of the Catholic historian Hefele:

"The decrees of the ancient ecumenical councils were confirmed by the emperors and by the popes; those of the later councils by the popes alone."—*A History of the Church Councils*, Rev. Charles Joseph Hefele, D. D., to 325 A. D. (first volume), p. 42.

"We see from these considerations of what value the sanction of the Pope is to the decrees of a council. Until the Pope has sanctioned these decrees, the assembly of bishops which formed them cannot pretend to the authority belonging to an ecumenical council,

however great a number of bishops may compose it; for there cannot be an ecumenical council without union with the Pope.

"This sanction of the Pope is also necessary for insuring infallibility to the decisions of the council. According to Catholic doctrine, this prerogative can be claimed only for the decisions of ecumenical councils, and only for their decisions *in rebus fidei et morum* [in matters of faith and morals], not for purely disciplinary decrees."—*Id.*, p. 52.

From another Catholic source we quote the following amazing declarations:

"He [the Pope] is not subject to them [the canons of the church], because he is competent to modify or to annul them when he holds this to be best for the church."—*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XII, art. "Pope," p. 268.

"The Pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man, but as it were God, and the vicar of God. . . .

"The Pope by reason of the excellence of his supreme dignity is called bishop of bishops. . . .

"He is likewise bishop of the universal church.

"He is likewise the divine monarch and supreme emperor, and king of kings.

"Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions.

"Moreover the superiority and the power of the Roman Pontiff by no means pertain only to heavenly things, to earthly things, and to things under the earth, but are even over angels, than whom he is greater.

"So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope.

"For he is of so great dignity and power that he forms one and the same tribunal with Christ.

"So that whatever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as according to most doctors, etc.

"The Pope is as it were God on earth, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been intrusted by the omnipotent God direction not only of the earthly but also of the heavenly kingdom.

"The Pope is of so great authority and power that he can modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws."—*Extracts from Ferraris's Ecclesiastical Dictionary (R. C.), article on the Pope.*

"The full title of this work is '*Prompta Bibliotheca canonica, juridica, moralis, theologica nec non ascetica, polemica, rubricistica, historica.*' There have been various editions of this book since the first was published in 1746, the latest one being issued from Rome

in 1899 at the Press of the Propaganda. This shows that this work still has the approval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the Catholic Encyclopedia (Vol. VI, p. 48) speaks of it as 'a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge' and 'a precious mine of information.' It is therefore legitimate to conclude that the statements in this work represent the current Roman Catholic view concerning the power and authority of the Pope."—*Note on the above quotation by the editors of the "Source Book for Bible Students," Washington, D. C., Review and Herald Pub. Assn.*

Thus it is clear that any number of actions taken by church councils regarding Sunday observance, or anything else, for that matter, could not have become accepted canon law of the Roman Catholic Church without the full approval of the popes. Had they been displeased with any of these, they had the full authority to alter them at will.

Now is the action of the Council of Laodicea regarding the change of the Sabbath recognized by the Roman Catholic Church as a binding obligation, and does the Roman Catholic Church recognize that the action involved a literal change of the Sabbath? For reply we quote the following from a recent Roman Catholic Catechism:

"Question.—Which is the Sabbath day?

"Answer.—Saturday is the Sabbath day.

"Ques.—Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

"Ans.—We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (336 A. D.), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday."—*"The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine," Rev. Peter Geiermann, C. SS. R., p. 50, 2d ed., 1910. (This work received the "apostolic blessing" of Pope Pius X, Jan. 25, 1910.)*

Note that this catechism received the blessing of Pope Pius X, which indicates that he approved and indorsed all its teachings.

Now, we believe that we have offered conclusive proof on three very important points:

1. Sunday observance originated in heathenism.
2. Sunday observance as a Christian ordinance is wholly a Catholic institution.

3. The change was made from Saturday to Sunday by actions of church councils, bulls issued by the popes, laws promulgated by Catholic emperors, and by the approval of popes of the various council proceedings.

We unhesitatingly reiterate, therefore, that Sunday is a papal festival, borrowed from paganism, and that *the original Sabbath was changed by the church councils and the popes*. The church could not have done it without the approval and blessing of the popes, and this was given in the most active manner, as we have already seen. Thus Mr. Carright's challenge to Seventh-day Adventists that the popes did not change the Sabbath is effectually answered.

FORETOLD BY PROPHETS

Now, to all this agree the words of the Bible prophets, for this whole matter is clearly foretold by them. In Daniel 7:25 the prediction is made that an apostate power, represented in the prophecy by a "little horn," would attempt to change God's times and laws: "He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, *and think to change times and laws*: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

This power was to continue forty-two months, or one thousand two hundred sixty days. Rev. 13:5; 12:6. A day for a year, according to Biblical interpretation of prophetic time, gives us 1260 years during which this power would hold sway in the world.

There is general agreement among students of prophecy that this power is papal Rome. The papal supremacy was fully established in 538 (the very year the Council of Orleans made its famous edict that people in the rural communities should not work, but attend church on Sunday) and received its deadly wound in 1798 (see Rev. 13:3), after a period of just 1260 years.

During this time the special efforts of this power were to

be directed against the Most High,—he would speak great words against the Most High, wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws,—evidently the laws of the Most High, as the change of human laws would not be worthy of notice in prophecy nor peculiar to this power.

Now, the law of the Most High contains ten distinct precepts. Nine of these precepts are acknowledged by all Protestant Christians to be binding. The other one, the fourth, is in dispute, and strange to say, it is the only one that relates in any way to *time*. It commands the observance of a specific day in each week, because that day is declared to be holy, and to belong to the Lord God. The first three commands and the last six are silent on the subject of time, but the fourth is based upon it. It deals with *God's time*, commanding man to remember it and not desecrate it by secular labor.

The prophecy asserts that this apostate power will seek to change times and laws, and the only way God's law could be altered so far as to affect God's time would be by a change in the Sabbath command.

Here, then, is a definite charge made by God Himself through His prophets that this little-horn power, the Papacy, would attempt to change His Sabbath.

But does the Catholic Church admit responsibility for having changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?

When an individual is charged with a crime (as God here charges the Papacy), the case is greatly strengthened if he makes a confession. When a defendant admits his own guilt, further testimony is scarcely necessary. Let us, then, bring leading representatives of this church onto the stand and hear their testimony on this point.

In a Catholic work called, "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," page 58, is the following:

"*Question*.—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

"*Answer*.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday."

We have this further testimony:

“*Question.*—Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

“*Answer.*—Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her,—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.”—“*Doctrinal Catechism,*” p. 174.

And the *Catholic Mirror*, the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons, in its issue of September 23, 1893, said:

“The Catholic Church, for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. . . . The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church, . . . without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.”

Another catechism, “The Catholic Christian Instructed,” page 209, says:

“*Question.*—What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath, which was Saturday?

“*Answer.*—We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

“*Ques.*—Does the Scripture anywhere command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

“*Ans.*—The Scripture commands us to hear the church, . . . but the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath.”

On page 15 of Volume IV of “Clifton Tracts” (Catholic), in an article on “A Question for All Bible Christians,” this question is thus dealt with:

“We Catholics, then, have precisely the same authority for keeping Sunday holy, instead of Saturday, as we have for every other article of our creed; namely, the authority of ‘the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth;’ whereas, you who are Protestants have really no authority for it whatever; for there is no authority for it in the Bible, and you will not allow that there can be authority for it anywhere else. Both you and we do, in fact, follow tradition in this matter; but we follow it, believing it to be a part of God’s word, and the church to be its divinely appointed guardian and interpreter; you follow it, de-

nouncing it all the time as a fallible and treacherous guide, which often makes the commandment of God of none effect."

In the *Catholic Press*, of Sydney, Australia, in its issue of August 25, 1900, there is found this statement:

"Sunday is a Catholic institution, and its claims to observance can be defended only on Catholic principles. . . . From beginning to end of the Scriptures there is not a single passage that warrants the transfer of weekly public worship from the last day of the week to the first."

Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, "Faith of Our Fathers," edition of 1893, page 111, says:

"You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify."

Father Walter Drum, S. J., of Woodstock College, Maryland, said:

"They [the Protestants] deem it their duty to keep the Sunday holy. Why?—Because the Catholic Church tells them to do so. They have no other reason."—*The Ecclesiastical Review*, February, 1914, Vol. 50, No. 2, p. 236.

The *Kansas City Catholic*, of February 9, 1893, said:

"The Catholic Church by its own infallible authority created Sunday a holy day to take the place of the Sabbath of the old law."

Thus it will be seen that the Roman Church deliberately confesses to the crime of tampering with the divine law in changing the observance of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. History as clearly and definitely testifies that the charge is true. And thus the Roman Church stands before the world convicted by her own testimony of laying impious hands upon the Sabbath of the Lord, and tearing from its place in the very heart of the law of God, the fourth commandment, substituting instead a spurious and counterfeit sabbath, which is no sabbath at all, since it rests solely on the traditions of that church, and not in any sense upon the word of God.

But let it be noticed, the Roman Church is more consistent in the observance of Sunday than are the Protestant churches.

As was shown in the preceding chapter, the Roman Church does not base its teachings on the *Bible alone*, but on the *Bible and tradition*, holding that tradition is the safer guide of the two. But the Protestant belief is that the Bible and the Bible alone is the foundation of true faith. Now the Sunday institution can be found only in tradition. *It cannot be found in the Bible.*

It is evident, therefore, that the Protestant churches, in observing Sunday, have left the true ground and basis of Protestantism, and are following the Roman Church in accepting a doctrine and practice which are not founded upon the Bible.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE PROTESTANT WORLD

Do the Protestant churches admit that there is no Bible authority for observing Sunday instead of Saturday? For reply, we offer the following testimony of some of their historians and leaders of religious thought:

“The current notion that Christ and His apostles authoritatively substituted the first day for the seventh is absolutely without any authority.”—*Lyman Abbott, in an editorial in the Christian Union, June 26, 1890.*

“And where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. . . . The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but because the church, has enjoined it.”—*“Plain Sermons on the Catechism,” Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D. (Church of England), Vol. I, pp. 334-336.*

“There was and is a commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will be said, however, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges, and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I have studied for many years, I ask, Where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament, absolutely not. There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week.

"I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people; and the only reason that it is not a more disturbing element in Christian thought and in religious discussions, is because the Christian world has settled down content on the conviction that somehow a transference has taken place at the beginning of Christian history. . . .

"To me it seems unaccountable that Jesus, during three years' intercourse with His disciples, often conversing with them upon the Sabbath question, discussing it in some of its various aspects, freeing it from its false glosses, never alluded to any transference of the day; also, that during forty days of His resurrection life, no such thing was intimated. Nor, so far as we know, did the Spirit which was given to bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever that He had said unto them, deal with this question. Nor yet did the inspired apostles, in preaching the gospel, founding churches, counseling and instructing those founded, discuss or approach this subject."—*Dr. Edward T. Hiscox, author of "The Baptist Manual," in a paper read before a New York Ministers' Conference, held November 13, 1893.*

Dr. N. Summerbell:

"The Roman Church had totally apostatized. . . . It reversed the fourth commandment by doing away with the Sabbath of God's word, and instituting Sunday as a holiday."—*"History of the Christian Church," pp. 417, 418. Cincinnati, 1873.*

THE MARK OF THE BEAST

As to whether or not the Catholic Church claims that the act of changing the Sabbath to Sunday is a "mark," or sign, of her power in religious matters, it is necessary for the reader only to review some of the quotations from Catholic authors already cited. Let us note again the first two that were given:

"You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify."—*"Faith of Our Fathers," p. III.*

"*Question.*—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

"*Answer.*—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday."—*"Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," p. 58.*

Here the change of the Sabbath is definitely set forth as

a "mark" of authority. The "act" is a mark of her ecclesiastical power. Her power to command feasts, etc., is proved by what she did to the Sabbath. Therefore, when Seventh-day Adventists refer to Sunday keeping as the "mark" of the Papacy, or of the beast of Revelation 13, which represents the papal church, they are only agreeing with what the Catholics claim for themselves.

Mr. Canright says:

"This Advent mark of the beast is an absurdity and only a scarecrow. Don't be frightened."—*"The Lord's Day,"* by D. M. Canright, p. 239.

But let it be carefully noted, dear reader, that against this "mark" God has sent to men the most fearful warning that is to be found in the Scriptures:

"The third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Rev. 14:9, 10.

There will be a company of people on earth when Jesus comes who will have gotten the victory over this apostate power, spoken of under the symbol of a beast, and also over his mark. Instead of drinking of the wine of God's wrath, they will be transported to the kingdom of our God, where John, in holy vision, saw them and heard them singing the song of the redeemed:

"I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints." Rev. 15:2, 3.

The sincere wish of the author is that in the day of God every reader of this volume may be found numbered among that glad, triumphant company.

CHAPTER X

THE SABBATH ON A ROUND WORLD

MR. CANRIGHT raises the old objection to the seventh-day Sabbath, that it cannot possibly be kept on a round world. Concerning this, he says:

“The stubborn facts nearer home show that God’s children do not, and cannot, all ‘observe the same period together.’ Everybody knows that it is Saturday in India some twelve hours sooner than it is here, and that it is Saturday here twelve hours after it has ceased to be Saturday there. In Australia the day begins eighteen hours sooner than it does in California. So the seventh-day brethren in California are working nearly the whole time that their brethren in Australia are keeping Sabbath! Come even nearer home than that. The sun sets about three hours later in California than it does in Maine. So when the Seventh-day Adventists in Maine begin to keep the Sabbath at sunset Friday evening, their own brethren in California, where the sun is yet three hours high, will still be at work for three hours! So, very few of them on this earth, ‘observe the same period together.’ While some of them are keeping Sabbath on one part of the earth, others of them are at work on another part of the earth.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*,” p. 174.

So there we have it. The world being round, it is impossible to obey God’s law in respect to the Sabbath, says Mr. Canright. Strange that God should have made a Sabbath for a world which He knew to be round, isn’t it? But there is a still stranger thing. That is, that this very same identical earth that is so round, and which rotates so fast that one cannot possibly keep the Sabbath, presents no difficulties whatever to the person who desires to keep Sunday! This we also are taught by Mr. Canright, for in the same chapter in which he attempts to prove that on account of the earth’s being a globe the Sabbath cannot be kept, he confidently informs us that Sunday can be kept. Note his teaching on this point:

“Under the new dispensation of the gospel, other circumstances have arisen plainly and grandly marking another day as the all-important day in Christian memory—the resurrection day.”—*Id.*, p. 176.

He further says:

“The essential idea is that we should devote one day in seven to religious duties. To secure the highest good, all should unite in observing the same day. From the days of the apostles the Christian church has, with one consent, observed the day on which Jesus rose from the dead, the first day of the week, or Sunday.”—*Id.*, p. 181.

He explains that the difficulty about keeping the Sabbath is the existence of a “day line,” and that this jumps about so from place to place that “there is no possible means of fixing the day of the original Sabbath.”—*Id.*, p. 184.

Surely this reasoning is more profound than enlightening. Just how it is that Saturday cannot possibly be kept on a round world, but Sunday can be, is, to say the least, a bit confusing. Does he perhaps mean that on Sunday the earth flattens out, and thus the difficulty is overcome for the day, and that it then resumes its globular form until the next Sunday rolls around? Or does the day line stay fixed on Sunday, so that the particular day can be located, and move about only on Saturday, making it impossible for *that* day to be found? In any event, there is evidently no difficulty experienced in locating Sunday in any part of the earth, for, according to Mr. Canright, “from the days of the apostles the Christian church has, *with one consent*, observed the day on which Jesus rose from the dead, *the first day of the week*, or Sunday.”

“From the days of the apostles.” This covers a period of nineteen hundred years. And, says he, during this period Christians have kept Sunday. They have done it, he claims, “with one consent,” that is, Christians in America, Europe, Australia, China, wherever they have been found during these nineteen hundred years, have all agreed on the question of which day was Sunday. They have done it “with one consent,” with

no mix-up over a round world, a day line, lost time, or any of these scary hobgoblins; they all agree that Sunday, the definite day upon which our Lord was raised, can be found, yea, has been found, and is everywhere known. Upon this all have been agreed for nineteen hundred years; and yet, would you believe it! the seventh day can neither be found nor kept! The world is too round; timekeeping has not been accurate enough; day lines move about so; the north and south poles present serious obstacles; and there are so many reasons—not the least of which is the fact that men invent such arguments for the express purpose of getting rid of a plain command of God with which their lives are not in harmony.

Surely this kind of reasoning answers itself. What candid person would say that Sunday can be kept on a round world that has a day line, but that Saturday cannot? What advantage could one day possibly have over another in this respect?

Seventh-day Adventists have never claimed that the Sabbath could be kept in all parts of the world at the same moment of time. They may be illiterate, as Mr. Canright tries to make them appear, but their ignorance does not quite reach to the point where they fail to recognize that each day of the week travels around the earth, and that the Sabbath therefore does not come to people in all places at once, and therefore cannot be kept by all people at the same time. What they do claim is that *wherever one may be, in the Orient or Occident, he can keep exactly the same day as his fellow Christians keep on the other side of the world, but his keeping of the day must be at the time when the day comes to him, and has no relation to the question as to when it comes to those in other countries.*

When God made the Sabbath, He made it for a round world, and made the sun "to rule the day." Gen. 1:16. Therefore, as an obedient child of God, it is my duty to keep the day when in the divine order it comes to me, without quibbling over God's arrangement or finding fault with His rulership.

As has been pointed out, Seventh-day Adventists have mis-

sions and missionaries in almost every land of earth, the "Land of the Midnight Sun" not excepted, and never yet have we heard from one of them or from their converts any complaint about not being able to find the Sabbath because the world is round, or for any other reason. Sabbath keepers are in no difficulty on this point. The difficulty, when it arises, is always in the mind of some one who desires to oppose and discredit the Sabbath, and never in the mind of one who desires to keep it.

THE DATE LINE, OR DAY LINE

Discussing the so-called lost-time question and the date line, in an article in *Present Truth*, published in Washington, D. C., in its issue of July 15, 1926, Mr. C. P. Bollman, associate editor of that periodical, said:

"Considerable dust has been thrown, in the study of this subject, by introducing the question of the date line, which the Standard Dictionary (article, 'Date;' subtitle, 'Date Line') defines thus:

"'An imaginary line fixed upon as the point where the reckoning of the calendar day changes: in nautical practice, the meridional line 180° from Greenwich, but practically running through Bering Strait and irregularly through the Pacific Ocean. East of this line the day is dated one day earlier than on the west of it.'

"This location of the day line, or date line, is not an arbitrary human arrangement, as might at first thought seem to be the case. Its establishment in the Pacific Ocean was clearly due to the position of the continents and the divine plan for peopling the earth. It is conceded by all that Asia was the cradle of the race. Spreading naturally from their original home, the children of men carried the day and week with them to the eastern confines of Asia, and to adjacent islands. But even before this was accomplished, the course of empire had begun to run toward the west, and so continued until the westward and higher tide of settlement and of civilization met the conservatism of the East in the Pacific Ocean. Thus God by His providence established the date line in the only place possible, all things considered. Man did not establish, but simply discovered, this line in the place where the Creator by His providence had put it when He made the world and formed man upon it.

"Technical questions as to the identity of the week and of the weekly Sabbath are never raised, except as an excuse for not obey-

ing the fourth commandment just as it reads,—‘The seventh day is the Sabbath.’ Nobody has any difficulty in identifying any day of either the month or the week in any part of the earth, except the seventh day.

“Large bodies of Christians, as the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, etc., emphasize just as strongly the importance of keeping the definite first day of the week, as do the Sabatarians the obligation to observe the definite, identical seventh day. Such technical questions are raised, not because of practical difficulties encountered in identifying the Sabbath in any part of the world, but only when an excuse is sought for not complying with the plain and explicit terms of the fourth commandment. The question is not only an impeachment of the intelligence of the great majority of both first-day and seventh-day observers, but infinitely worse yet, it charges the Almighty Himself with folly in giving to the race a commandment that in its very nature could not be obeyed. All the other days can be clearly defined, but the Creator’s memorial of His finished work is so illusive, some would have us believe, that it cannot be identified!

“The fact is that not the Jews only, but the whole world, in the providence of God, have the weekly cycle, to which no reasonable or probable origin can be assigned other than the Mosaic and other ancient and similar accounts of creation. The Creator says in His law: ‘Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath.’ Ex. 20:8-10.”

LOST TIME

Speaking to the question of a proposed thirteen-month calendar, in the House of Representatives, June 11, 1929, Mr. Sol Bloom, a member from New York City, said this concerning the possibility of losing or gaining time in travel:

“When we speak of losing or gaining a day in travel, we are really giving a new definition of the word. We are defining days, not in terms of the journey of the earth on its axis, but rather in terms of the journey of human beings around the earth, which is quite a different thing. The trouble, of course, grows out of the fact that the traveler moves from the given point at which he began to measure the day. If days be defined in terms of man’s journey around the earth, without making allowance for his changing point of measurement, then the most unbelievable possibilities arise.

“Let us imagine an airplane capable of traveling a thousand miles an hour. A man starts westward in such a plane at noon Sunday. The sun is always overhead, because he travels westward at the same rate as the sun. Twenty-four hours later—that is, on

Monday noon—he reaches again the spot whence he started, and still the sun shines overhead. When he alights from his machine, would he be correct in declaring that it was still Sunday noon?

“DAYS CHANGE IN TRAVELING

“When a person travels, his days are of abnormal length.

“For example, the New Yorker who travels westward across the United States finds it necessary to set his watch back one hour on three different occasions in order that the time by his watch shall correspond with the true course of the day. Otherwise his watch will register 3 P. M. when the California sun is only at high noon.

“Pursuing such a course westward at a thousand miles a day will bring the traveler back to his starting place in twenty-four days—estimating the world’s circumference at exactly 24,000 miles, for the sake of the illustration.

“But each of his twenty-four days has been twenty-five hours long. Therefore in his trip around the world he had accumulated a total of twenty-four extra hours. If he has not already dropped them an hour at a time, he must finally drop the whole twenty-four at once, if he wishes to keep his reckoning correct. Now twenty-four hours equal one day. Therefore he drops a day. But is a moment really stricken from his life on that account?”

To say that “the Sabbath cannot be kept at the same identical moment of time in different time belts,” is to assume a difficulty which does not exist. As Mr. Bloom says:

“Neither the Sabbath command nor the Bible anywhere speaks of time belts, or of keeping the Sabbath at the same identical moment of time. The Good Book tells us that we should keep the seventh day, and that we should keep it ‘from evening to evening.’

“Mr. Speaker, God does not ask man to base his obedience upon what other men in other parts of the world may be doing.”

All of which is good, sound common sense, and is moreover in harmony with the Scripture.

The human family, in God’s providence, began to make its circuit of the earth from Western Asia and the eastern Mediterranean. One portion of mankind went eastward through Asia into the fringe of islands on that side of the Pacific, carrying the reckoning of time. Another portion of the human family journeyed westward, across Europe and into the New World of the Americas and the island fringe beyond,

carrying the reckoning of time. There is exact agreement the world over. In God's providence the westward and the eastward march of civilization meet in the mid-Pacific, and there, as we have already seen, His own providence, in the history of the human race, fixes the day line.

A just solution to this day-line, round-world problem, therefore, shows that no real difficulty exists in the matter of keeping the Sabbath, and that as a matter of fact any day can be found on any part of the earth, and observed by those who are disposed to do so.

True, those who keep the Sabbath cannot begin its observance simultaneously in all parts of the world, for, as has already been shown, the day does not begin on all parts of the world at the same time. One cannot begin to keep the seventh day until that day comes to that part of the world where he is. It is not one seventh part of time, a specific, uniform twenty-four-hour period to be kept by all at the same identical time, that God has hallowed and sanctified, but *the seventh day*. It matters not to the Sabbath observer in China whether or not his brethren in America start and close the Sabbath just when he does, but he is particular about keeping the same day that they keep when it comes around to him. The Sabbath is none the less sacred to him because of the fact that it is not observed at the same identical instant of time by others in other lands.

No one in New York or Chicago would refuse a Monday morning's paper because in Berlin or London the people have had their Monday's paper hours before. We each take up Monday's duties when Monday comes, wherever we are. All the Lord asks of man is that he shall keep the seventh day holy when that day comes to him. And it will come. The sun is the divinely appointed timekeeper for man (Gen. 1:15-18), and it never fails. When the holy day comes, keep it.

The Sabbath comes to the East before it comes to the West; but as it passes around the world, it is the same blessed, holy day everywhere.

The day line in the Pacific Ocean, which is offered as evidence that the Creator made a world and a Sabbath which do not fit together, is in itself an absolute answer to the argument that the fourth commandment means only that one day in seven should be kept. It is said that Sunday is a seventh part of time; and so Sunday, the first day, will do as well as Saturday, the seventh day. But the fact that every traveler must change his own reckoning of time by one day in crossing the Pacific in order to keep the true sun time, which marks the days for all nations, forever dispenses with this "seventh part of time" theory. The transpacific traveler could not follow the "seventh part of time" theory and still keep his Sunday. For in traveling one direction he would have a week of only six days, and the other way his week would have eight days. Thus if he stuck to Sunday, he would find himself observing either one sixth part of time or one eighth part of time during the week in which the line is crossed, depending upon the direction traveled. But no such dilemma ever confronts the Sabbath keeper. He observes *a day*, not a certain part of time. Wherever he finds "the seventh day" or wherever the seventh day finds him, he keeps it.

IN THE LAND OF THE MIDNIGHT SUN

But can the Sabbath be found and kept in the Land of the Midnight Sun, where it is six months day and six months night? We will permit Mr. Canright to reply to this objection. The following paragraphs were printed by him before he rejected the true Sabbath and while his vision was still clear:

"It is claimed that at the north pole there are several weeks when the sun does not set at all; and again there are weeks when it is dark all the time. How can the seventh day be distinguished and kept there? . . .

"Frequently those who raise this objection are strict observers of Sunday, the first day of the week. If there is any force in this objection, it comes with equal weight against Sunday keeping. How can they keep the first day there? If they can find the first

day, cannot we find the seventh? If they can keep Sunday, cannot we keep the Sabbath? But there is no trouble in either case. The days of the week are plainly marked there as well as here. Read the travels of Drs. Kane, Hall, and others who have been there. Did they experience any difficulty in keeping the reckoning of the days? None whatever. The days are marked off by the revolutions of the earth, which are there, as well as here, indicated by the position of the sun. The most of the year, the sun rises and sets there the same as here; that is, as far north as men have ever penetrated. [Or, in other words, as far north as there are human inhabitants.] So far, there is no difficulty, of course. In mid-summer, for a short time, the sun is above the horizon all the time. Being so far north, a person can see the sun in its entire circuit around the earth, day and night. But it is easy to tell when it is overhead at noon, when it is going down in the west, when it is directly underneath at midnight, or when it is rising in the east in the morning. Can we not tell the time of day here by the position of the sun in the heavens without seeing it rise and set? Certainly. Then if we could see it all the way around, could we not tell just as well as when we see it only part of the way around? Of course; and so those testify who have been in the arctic regions. . . .

“But how is it in the winter when it is night for weeks together? I believe there is no time that rays of light cannot be seen in the south at noon of each day. This would be sufficient to mark each day. But the revolution of the earth can be as plainly and as easily told by the position of the stars at night as it can by the sun at day. Any one accustomed to observing the stars knows this. They appear to rise and set and to go around the earth the same as the sun. Indeed, astronomers always reckon the day by the stars. Read the following letter which I received from an eminent astronomer touching this point:

“‘OGDEN, UTAH, Sept. 24, 1873.

“‘ELDER D. M. CANRIGHT: By observations of the stars, the time can be found out at any time, day or night. Knowing the time at which any star ought to be in the meridian, we find the difference between noon and the observing time, or the local time. Stars being visible in the daytime and at night, on all places of the earth, it is possible to determine the time without seeing the sun.

“(Signed,) ‘DR. F. KAMPF,

“‘*Astronomer of the U. S. Corps of Engineers.*’

“So, then, the exact time of day can be told by the stars, and they can be seen in the absence of the sun. Hence this objection is without foundation. . . .

“Those who keep Sunday live in all parts of the earth, and have traveled all around it both ways. Do they find any difficulty in keeping the first day? Not in the least. This objection is all imaginary; for, practically, no one ever had any such trouble. Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists are scattered nearly around the globe; and yet they find no difficulty in keeping the seventh-day Sabbath. . . .

“The Lord commands His servants all around the world to keep the seventh day. Each one is to keep it when it comes where he is, not when it comes where some one else is. When it comes to those in Asia, they can keep it. Several hours later, it comes to England, and then they keep it, and so on around the world.

“This is sufficient to show that there is no such difficulty as this objection supposes.”—“*The Morality of the Sabbath*,” by D. M. Canright, pp. 80-87.

“And now to trace you round this rolling world,
An eastern and a western route you’ve twirled,
And made out nothing by the spacious travel,
But what I call a wretched, foolish cavil.
And now to make you clearly understand
That Sabbath day may be in every land,
At least those parts where mortal men reside
(And nowhere else can precepts be applied),
There was a place where first the orb of light
Appeared to rise, and westward took its flight;
That moment, in that place the day began,
And as he in his circuit westward ran,
Or rather, as the earth did eastward spin,
To parts more westward daylight did begin.
And thus at different times, from place to place,
The day began—this clearly was the case.
And I should think a man must be a dunce
To think that day began all round at once,
So that in foreign lands it doth appear,
There was a first day there as well as here.
And if there was a first, the earth around,
As sure as fate *the seventh can be found*.
And thus you see it matters not a whit,
On which meridian of earth we sit,
Since each distinctly had its dawn of light,
And ever since, successive day and night;
Thus while our antipodes in darkness sleep,
We here the true, primeval Sabbath keep.”

—William Stillman, quoted in
Review and Herald, Feb. 3, 1852.

CHAPTER XI

DOING OR BELIEVING

THROUGHOUT his book Mr. Canright gives the impression to his readers that Seventh-day Adventists endeavor to secure salvation by the works of the law instead of through faith in Jesus Christ. He quotes one Milton F. Gowell, whom he represents as a former Seventh-day Adventist, as giving a true picture of advent experience, in the following words:

“All the *doing* was indelibly impressed on my mind as a boy, but the *believing* on Christ for salvation, and *resting* in His finished work, I have no remembrance of whatever.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced.*” p. 61.

Now, a statement could hardly be made about Seventh-day Adventists that would be more completely misrepresentative than this one. Trusting in the law for salvation is exactly what Seventh-day Adventists *do not do*. They realize that the law has no power to pardon a sinner or give life to the soul. And, further, they understand clearly that, even after conversion, the human flesh, unaided by the Holy Spirit, is entirely too weak to keep a law so high and holy as is the law of our God. Their dependence is ever and always only in Christ.

The law, however, is the very instrument that the Holy Spirit uses to lead men and woman to Jesus their Saviour, “for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Rom. 3:20. It is the law that condemns the sinner, and thus makes him feel his need of a Saviour. The patient must first realize that he is sick before he will call a physician. Just so, sinners will not be constrained to flee to Christ for pardon, justification, and eternal life until by some means they have been made painfully conscious of sin and of its blighting, soul-destroying effect upon the life.

It is by the commandment that sin is made to appear in its true light. On this point Paul explains:

"Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." Rom. 7:12, 13.

Thus it is by contact with the holy law of God that men learn that sin is *exceeding sinful* and is *working death* in them. James compares it to a looking-glass:

"Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." James 1:22-25.

The law, then, is a great mirror which reveals our true character and our actual worth in God's sight. It shows up every spot, every stain that sin has made, every evil propensity of the flesh, in fact, everything that makes us unfit for heaven. But the law cannot remove a single stain from our lives or grant us pardon for a single transgression. Neither can it impart power whereby we can bring our lives into harmony with its high standard. For this it must refer us to Jesus. Thus it "brings us to Christ."

Just as a mirror can reveal a spot on the face and convince us of the fact that something must be done to remove it, so the law points out our sins, the spots on our characters, and reveals to us the absolute need of cleansing. But the mirror cannot remove the spot from the face. Soap and water must do that. And just so with the law. It can reveal the plague spots of sin, but it cannot remove them. The blood of Jesus must do that. There is no other remedy. This is the fountain that has been opened in the house of David for sin and uncleanness, and there is no other cleansing agency for sin. "Neither

is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12.

Said Mr. Canright before he left the Seventh-day Adventists:

"Paul argues that no one can be justified by the works of the law; and this is true of any law, moral or ceremonial. It is true of the moral law as well as of the ceremonial law. 'Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin;' 'for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' Rom. 3:20, 23.

"Why can no one be justified by the observance of the moral law? Because of the simple fact that when you have once broken that law, it must always condemn you. What kind of a law would that be that would justify the man who broke it? Now, all have broken the moral law, and hence it must condemn everybody. There is no pardon in it. Neither could the observance of the typical law take away sins, as we have before shown that Paul repeatedly affirms. 'For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.' (See also Heb. 7:18, 19; 10:1-4; 9:9-14.)

"Consider a moment; what is there in the shedding of the blood of an animal that could take away a man's sins? Absolutely nothing. So, then, there was no law given, the observance of which could pardon sin or justify the sinner; and hence Paul says to the Galatians: 'For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.' 'For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.' Gal. 2:21; 3:21. So the great apostle truthfully argues that pardon and justification cannot be obtained by law of any kind. It must come through faith in Christ, through the unmerited mercy of God."—*"The Two Laws,"* by D. M. Canright, pp. 68, 69.

It was for the purpose of accomplishing what the law could not do that God sent His Son into the world. Thus Paul declares:

"What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

There was no weakness in the law, but "the flesh" was too weak to keep it. Man had been weakened by sin, and had no

power within himself to do right. The righteousness of the law could not be fulfilled in him until the guilt of past sin was removed, and he was strengthened by the indwelling Spirit. But to *accomplish this*, God sent His own Son into the world, and He proved Himself to be abundantly able to do for man all that the law could not do. Therefore with the law to reveal sin and with Christ to save from sin, there is provided for man full and complete salvation.

When Jesus was upon the earth, He lived a life in perfect harmony with the law of God. He declared, "I have kept My Father's commandments." John 15:10. His life was one of perfect obedience. "In Him was no sin." He declared that He had come "to fulfill" (fully keep) the law (Matt. 5:17); and therefore the righteousness of the law was fully revealed in His life.

Now with us it is just the opposite. We have all "sinned, and come short of the glory of God," "as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:23, 10-12. When a sinner, therefore, comes to that point in his life where, by contact with the law of God, he is made to realize his lost condition and to desire a life of holiness, he must first deal with the guilt of past sins. These he is powerless to remove, and to this end he finds no help in the law. It only condemns and reveals the existing need of help. It is powerless to render aid.

"How then can man be justified with God?" Job 25:4. The answer is at hand: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John 1:9. This, then, is the way of salvation. It comes through confession and repentance of sin, and through faith that Jesus can and does save. And when Jesus cleanses a sinner from his past sins, He does a thorough work;

He cleanses "from all unrighteousness." "Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 7:25. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:36.

CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS BECOMES OURS

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by Him all that believe are justified." Acts 13:38, 39. Now how does this justification come about? How can a man be justified from sins which he has actually committed, and which are recorded again him on the books in heaven?

We answer: *It is by an act of Christ, whereby He assumes responsibility for our sin, and imputes to us the righteousness of His life.* He counts that our transgressions were committed by Him, for which He paid the penalty on the cross, and that His obedience was performed by us. Our books of record reveal lives of perfect obedience to the law, since all past sins are forgiven, and His perfect righteousness has been imputed to us. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. Thus Jesus takes away the sins of the world by taking them unto Himself and placing His righteousness upon the sinner. This He can do without having actual guilt attached to Himself, since He has already paid the penalty for our sins in His death on the cross.

When the prodigal son returned to his father, his own tattered garments were exchanged for the best robe in the house. The father took away the old garments, and clothed the son in his own rich apparel. It was of a similar experience that Isaiah sang in his day: "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with

ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels." Isa. 61:10.

This process of justification by faith is clearly stated by the great apostle to the Gentiles in the following language:

"Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness: that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:22-26.

Thus it is *the righteousness of Christ* that is received by the sinner when he turns to God for help. God declares Christ's righteousness to be ours.

This righteousness of Christ is declared for the "remission" (margin, "passing over") of sins that are past. It is imputed to the sinner just as though it were actually his, and he now stands before God with a perfect record of purity and obedience, which he had no part whatever in making, but which he has received as a gift from Christ. The sinner now appears before God as innocent as if he had never sinned.

Justification, therefore, does not come by "doing" the law, but by faith in Christ. When that faith is exercised, then Christ's law keeping is imputed to the sinner; and thus by His obedience the transgressor is declared to be righteous. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5:19. It is by Christ's obedience that we are made righteous. He obeyed for us, and now He substitutes His obedience for our past disobedience; and thus we stand justified before God.

When a man is converted, two distinct changes take place. One is called the new birth; the other, justification. The first takes place *in* the man himself, being wrought by the Spirit of God. He is given a new heart; all things become

new. The second is his changed standing in God's sight. This is justification, and this is the change that is wrought by the righteousness of Christ being imputed to him.

This brings us to a consideration of the Christian life, or the life after conversion, and the attitude of the newborn, justified man to the law of God. On this point Paul inquires: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Rom. 6:1, 2. Sin is the transgression of the law, hence Paul is really saying, "Shall we continue to transgress the law in order that God's grace may be even more abundantly manifested by continuing to forgive and justify us?" To this he makes the most emphatic reply, "God forbid."

It is, therefore, not God's plan that converted men should transgress His law, but rather "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:4. Sin is no longer to have dominion over the life. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Rom. 6:6, 12.

But it is impossible for any man to keep perfectly the law of Jehovah in his own strength. What Christ said is verily as true of him now as before, that "without Me ye can do nothing." How, then, may God's will be accomplished in the life? The answer is found in the words of the beloved disciple: "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to those that believe on His name." John 1:12.

The secret is couched in that expression, "as many as received Him." Those who receive Him, find power. The power comes through receiving Him. Herein is revealed one of the most marvelous and astounding truths of the gospel,—

that it is God's purpose that the Christian shall actually receive Christ into his life and permit Him to live and reign there, perfecting in him the same righteousness that was revealed in the life of Christ nineteen hundred years ago. This is the mystery spoken of by Paul when he said:

"Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is *Christ in you*, the hope of glory: whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: whereunto I also labor, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily." Col. 1 :26-29.

"Christ in you," then, is the secret. This constitutes our hope of glory. Without this experience we are helpless, and for us there is no salvation. But with Christ in control of the life, our strivings and labors are not performed in human weakness, but are "*according to His working, which worketh*" in us *mightily*. Again Paul talks of this experience in his epistle to the Ephesians, thus:

"That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory." Eph. 3:16-21.

Note carefully the expressions used. We are "*to be strengthened with might . . . in the inner man.*" This is to be accomplished by Christ dwelling in the heart; and when He dwells in the heart, He is "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." And this doing is not through our poor weakness, but through "the power that worketh in us." And that power is Christ in the person of the Holy Spirit.

Once again the apostle repeats it, this time in his letter to the Hebrews:

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever.” Heb. 13:20, 21.

Here, then, the plan is clear and plain. We can be made “perfect in every good work to do His will.” This perfection is not obtained by struggle and effort on our part, but through the operation of the power of the indwelling Christ. It is His “working in you” that brings the perfection. Our working is all a failure; His working is always a glorious success. When, therefore, He works in and through us, He brings success and perfection to our lives, just as He worked it out in His own life when here in the flesh.

Once again the Pauline letters repeat the blessed truth, this time in the message to the Galatian church:

“I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.” Gal. 2:20.

This is the glorious result of having Christ live in the heart. The life that is lived is, then, no longer ours, but “Christ liveth in me.” It is His life lived over again in our flesh. We have relinquished the throne, and He is in control. Now we can exclaim, “I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.” Phil. 4:13.

Christ declares Himself to be “the same yesterday, and today, and forever.” Heb. 13:8. When He was upon earth in the flesh, He demonstrated that He was a commandment keeper. “I have kept My Father’s commandments” (John 15:10), He said; and David prophesied of Him: “Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of Me, I delight to do Thy will, O My God: yea, Thy law is within

My heart." Ps. 40:7, 8. Since, therefore, it is Christ's desire to do the Father's will, and since the law of God is written in His heart, the life that He will live today in our flesh will also be a life in harmony with that law. He will literally keep the law in us and through us, and thereby bring our lives into perfect accord with its holy precepts.

This is what Paul refers to when he says that God sent His Son to make it possible. "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:4. When, therefore, Jesus was here in the flesh, He kept the law *for* us. Now He offers to dwell in our hearts by His Holy Spirit, and keep His law *in* and *through* us. The first was a work of God *for* man, the second is a work of God *in* man. The first we had nothing to do with, but to receive it by faith; the second we cannot accomplish, but it is wrought in us by the Spirit through faith. Thus "by the obedience of One" we are made righteous, and justified from our past sins; and also by "the obedience of One" (now obeying in us) we are kept righteous day by day. This truth reveals how it is that to the Christian "Christ is all, and in all." Col. 3:11. We are justified by faith in Christ, and the just must live by faith in Him. Thus we are "saved by His life." Rom. 5:10.

THE FRUITS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

It is therefore clear that righteousness comes as a result of faith. Good works in keeping the law of God are the logical sequence, or fruits, of the indwelling of the Spirit of God. One cannot save himself by keeping the law, but a saved man will keep the law because of the fact that he is saved. It is the fruit by which the tree is known.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree

bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." Matt. 7:16-20.

Here Jesus makes it clear that the man must first *be* good before he can *do* good. "If a man love Me," said Jesus, "he will keep My words." John 14:23. The loving must come first, the keeping follows.

This great truth is further set forth in the epistle to the Romans, where Paul uses the experience of Abraham as an example of the way good works testify to the present faith-righteousness:

"In this way David also tells of the blessedness of the man to whose credit God places righteousness, apart from his actions. 'Blessed,' he says, 'are those whose iniquities have been forgiven, and whose sins have been covered over. Blessed is the man of whose sin the Lord will not take account.'

"This declaration of blessedness, then, does it come simply to the circumcised, or to the uncircumcised as well? For Abraham's faith—so we affirm—was placed *to his credit* as righteousness (Gen. 15:6). What then were the circumstances under which this took place? Was it after he had been circumcised, or before? Before, not after. And he received circumcision as a sign, a mark attesting the reality of the faith-righteousness which was his while still uncircumcised." Rom. 4:6-11, Weymouth's "New Testament in Modern Speech."

So in Abraham's case his righteousness was not produced by his works of circumcision, etc., but the works appeared because of that righteousness. Circumcision became a *sign* of the fact that he was righteous.

Now, let us apply this to our own experience. Do we receive righteousness before we keep the law or after?—*Before*, not after. And we receive law keeping "as a sign, a mark attesting the reality of the faith-righteousness" which comes to us by believing on Christ and permitting Him to dwell in the soul. Thus our righteousness does not come by the "deeds of the law," but the deeds of the law do witness to its presence and to its genuineness. (See Rom. 3:21.) Thus John the beloved declares: "He that saith, I know Him, and

keepeth not His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in Him." 1 John 2:4, 5.

By this it is seen that faith does not make void the law, but rather establishes it. (See Rom. 3:31.) In fact, without this "faith-righteousness," all our efforts to keep the law are doomed to utter failure; but trusting Him to do the work, our weakness is overcome, we become connected with the boundless power of Omnipotence, and thus we "can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth" us. Phil. 4:13. In this way our faith is shown by our works, as stated by the apostle James: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." James 2:17, 18.

CHAPTER XII

THE TWO COVENANTS

IN his chapter on this subject Mr. Carright contends that the "old covenant" spoken of by Paul as having passed away, consisted of, or at least included, the ten commandment law and the seventh-day Sabbath. We quote his words:

"The abolition of the Sinaitic covenant carries with it the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath so completely that no authoritative trace of it can be found this side of the grave of our risen Lord."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 350.

Again:

"Now notice how plainly and how repeatedly the ten commandments are called 'the covenant,' which God gave at Sinai to Israel when He brought them out of Egypt."—*Id.*, p. 353.

And again:

"Notice the points in this. Jesus is Mediator of a better covenant than the old. Verse 6. Then we have something better than the decalogue."—*Id.*, p. 355.

This, of course, is not a new argument. We have often heard it from the no-law advocates. It is a subtle line of reasoning, and to one not familiar with the subject of the two covenants, is, to say the least, a bit confusing. But this entire effort to get rid of the law of God via the old covenant argument, is based upon an entirely erroneous premise, i. e., that the decalogue was the old covenant. When this premise is removed, as it is not difficult to do, the entire line of argument collapses. In considering this subject, we desire, for the sake of clarity, to divide it into four subdivisions, as follows:

1. What the old covenant was not.
2. What the old covenant was.
3. The new covenant.
4. The new covenant, effective both before and after the cross.

WHAT THE OLD COVENANT WAS NOT

The old covenant was not the ten commandments, as Mr. Canright would have us believe. This fact is clearly revealed by many of the conflicting characteristics attributed to these two instruments. The things said of either one of them could not by any possible means apply to the other. The distinction between them is as clear as day.

For instance, we find the Lord speaking of the new covenant as being "a better covenant" than the old one. Heb. 8:6. This clearly indicates that the old covenant was not perfect in its provisions. There was weakness in it, and that weakness was to be corrected in the new covenant.

But of the ten commandments the Lord declares: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Ps. 19:7. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12. But the old covenant was imperfect and faulty. Therefore it is evident that the old covenant and the decalogue, though related, are certainly not identical. The ten commandments cannot be the old covenant.

Of the new covenant God says that it was to be "established upon better promises." Heb. 8:6. This clearly indicates that some of the promises of the old covenant were poor. These poor promises were made, not by God, but by the people when they promised more than they could perform. The fault was "with them," the Lord declares in verse 8. Their promises were not reliable. The new covenant had better promises, not made by sinful men, but by the Lord Himself.

The old covenant is declared to have been "faulty." "If that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8:7.

But this could not possibly apply to the ten commandments, which, as we have seen, are clearly declared to be "perfect," "holy, and just, and good." A thing cannot be faulty and perfect at the same time.

Paul declared that the old covenant was "*ready to vanish away.*" "In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Heb. 8:13.

But this same apostle states that the law, instead of vanishing away, was definitely established by faith. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31. A thing cannot "vanish away" and be established at the same time. Jesus also makes this point clear when He declares: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. Now, heaven and earth have not "passed." Therefore this is positive evidence that not a jot nor tittle of the law has failed. No part of it has vanished away.

And again the apostle Paul, some thirty years after the cross, wrote these words concerning the decalogue: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Rom. 3:19.

These considerations show conclusively that Mr. Canright is wrong when he declares that the old covenant was the decalogue, and that with its passing both the decalogue and the Sabbath passed away. The old covenant *was not* the ten commandments, and therefore, the passing of this covenant did not in any way affect the moral law.

WHAT THE OLD COVENANT WAS

The old covenant was an agreement between God and the people of Israel *concerning the keeping of His law.* It did not consist of the law, but it had to do with the law, and so, for that matter, does the new covenant.

When God had brought Israel out of Egypt, He led them by way of Sinai. They reached this place in the third month of their travels. (See Ex. 19:1.) It was here that the Lord

called Moses to come up into the mount to commune with Him. There God revealed to His servant that He was about to speak His law to Israel, but that before doing so He wished to make a covenant, or agreement, with them. He therefore instructed Moses to return to the camp and say to Israel: "Now therefore, *if ye will obey My voice indeed*, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people: for all the earth is Mine; and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." Ex. 19:5, 6.

When Moses repeated these words to Israel, "all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Verse 8.

Here, then, was a definite agreement, or covenant, between God and His people. God offers to bless Israel if they will obey His voice. They agree to be obedient. Mr. Canright quotes Webster as stating that a covenant is "a mutual consent or agreement of two or more persons to do or forbear some act or thing; a contract."—"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 351.

Here, then, we have found the agreement made at Sinai. It consisted in definite promises made by God to His people, and in promises made by the people to God. God's promises were good, but the people's promises were like ropes of sand. This made the covenant faulty. It was established upon poor promises. Sinful men, with carnal hearts, had made a high agreement to keep a holy and perfect law, whereas "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. In their agreement they had not taken the weakness of the flesh into account. They put no reliance in the power of the Holy Spirit. They felt self-sufficient; and in their self-sufficiency they trusted not in God, but in themselves.

Jesus once said to the Jews of His day: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered

Him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest Thou, Ye shall be made free?" John 8:32, 33. It was this same spirit which led them to speak with such assurance in entering into the old covenant relationship.

It was just after this agreement was made at Sinai that God spoke the law of the ten commandments and wrote it upon tables of stone. When this was accomplished, Moses wrote the words of the agreement, or the old covenant, that had been entered into, in a book, and once more read them in the hearing of Israel, and they reiterated their promise, saying: "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." (See Ex. 24:4-7.) Then Moses "sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Verses 5-8.

Thus it is clear that the old covenant made at Sinai *was not the commandments*, but, on the part of the people, an *agreement to keep God's law*, and on God's part a promise to give them certain blessings conditional upon obedience. The law was that concerning which the covenant was made, but it was not the covenant itself. The weakness of this covenant was the fact that it was based upon the principle, "Do and live," whereas the people could not do, because they were carnal and trusted in the flesh, and therefore were unable to fulfill the covenant provisions. God knew that in their mere human strength they would be unable to keep it, and evidently the reason it was given was that it might serve as an everlasting lesson to man regarding his own weakness and his utter helplessness without God.

THE NEW COVENANT

One fault Mr. Canright finds with the old covenant was that it was made with Israel. But so is the new covenant. The difference between these two covenants lies chiefly in the character of the *promises*. In the old covenant some of these were made by God and some by the people. In the new covenant they are all made by the Lord.

With this thought in mind, let us carefully note the terms of this new covenant.

“But now hath He [Christ] obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also He is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.

“For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know Me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.” Heb. 8:6-13.

Let it be carefully noted that the promises here are all made by Christ the Lord. He declares: “This is the covenant that I will make.” “I will put My laws into their mind.” “I will be to them a God.” “I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” The old covenant was made between God and sinners; the new covenant is made between God and those who accept Jesus and who own Him as their Lord and Mediator. He can make no promises of obedience for any but those who are fully

surrendered to the control of His Spirit; hence no sinner can come under this covenant until He accepts Jesus as his Saviour. It is made with *Israel*; but this time it is spiritual Israel, and not the literal descendants of Abraham.

“Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel. Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.” Rom. 9:6-8.

“He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” Rom. 2:28, 29.

“As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Gal. 3:27-29.

Observe that the new covenant is made *concerning* the law of God. In this particular it is no different from the old. Its object is to assure the keeping of God’s statutes by the covenanters. But in this covenant man is not left to struggle alone, in human weakness, in his efforts to keep the law, but our Lord Himself promises, “I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts.” How different this is from having the law written only upon stone, and sin still in the heart! When the law is only upon stone, it serves as an instrument of condemnation. All the struggles of the human heart to keep it end in failure. But when, by the Spirit of God, this law is written upon the heart, then there is victory and power and perfection. Then it is that “the righteousness of the law” is “fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” Rom. 8:4.

“Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart. And such trust have we through Christ to Godward: not

that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." 2 Cor. 3:3-9.

So the "ministration" (or the manner of administering the law) even under the old covenant, was glorious, in that it revealed God's perfect character and glory; but under the old covenant the law of God served only as a ministration of condemnation, or death. Under the old covenant the people had only the letter of the law written and engraved on stones. They failed to accept either the spirit of the law or the Spirit of God into their hearts. The old covenant therefore had no salvation in it.

Under the new covenant the ministration is changed. Therefore those who were saved in the old dispensation had to be saved under the terms of the new covenant, as we shall show later. It is the ministration of the Spirit. The Spirit takes this same law that was then written upon stone, and now writes it upon the "fleshy tables of the heart." Its principles become an integral part of our very nature. "Old things"—the carnal, fleshly lusts—"are passed away; behold, all things are become new." 2 Cor. 5:17. Our trust is no longer in the power and strugglings of the flesh to keep the law, but in the indwelling Christ. "Whereunto I also labor, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily." Col. 1:29. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." 2 Cor. 3:5.

This, then, becomes a "ministration of righteousness." The righteousness of the law, which is none other than the righteousness of Christ, is ministered to the life of the believer by the

Holy Spirit. It is the new covenant relationship, and through this relationship alone is it possible for human beings to obey God's law in an acceptable manner. Therefore "if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory."

But this law which is written upon the heart by the ministration of the Spirit under the new covenant, is not a new law, but is the same as that which was written upon the tables of stone. It is not changed by a single jot or tittle. It therefore still declares to the heart of the believer that "the seventh day is the Sabbath. . . . In it thou shalt not do any work." It has no new provisions except the provision made by the indwelling Christ, which makes it possible for us to keep its every precept.

NEW COVENANT EFFECTIVE BEFORE THE CROSS

Now, the new covenant is not called "new" because of its being a more recent provision than the old. In fact, it is much older than the Sinaitic covenant. God's promise was made to Adam and Eve in Eden immediately after the fall, and has been renewed to all succeeding generations thereafter. When the Lord said to the serpent: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her Seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel" (Gen. 3:15), He couched in those few words the first promise of a mighty Deliverer from the power of sin. This was the beginning of the new covenant with man. This promise introduced man to the plan of deliverance through Christ, the Seed. It was his first lesson in the inability of man to deliver himself from sin, or regain the moral perfection demanded by the law which he had broken. It revealed his utter dependence upon Christ, the coming Deliverer.

This was the covenant that was made with Abraham. It is said of him that he was justified *by faith*. "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh,

hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. 4:1-3.

This same covenant was known to Isaac and Jacob, and in fact to all the Old Testament worthies. It is outlined in Jeremiah's prophecies. It was spoken of by David. Thus the new covenant stretches both sides of the cross, and spans the gulf from Eden lost to Eden restored. The only reason it is spoken of as "new" is the fact that it was ratified at a later date than the Sinaitic covenant. The old covenant was ratified by Moses at Sinai with the blood of beasts; the new covenant was ratified on Calvary by the precious blood of Jesus. In that sense it is new. In every other respect it antedates the old one.

No one was ever saved under the terms of the old covenant. It provided only for righteousness by works, and so held no more hope of salvation for sinners before the cross than after. All who were saved before the cross were saved under the terms of the new covenant. They were saved by faith, and not by the works of the law. Their law keeping grew out of their faith-righteousness, but did not produce it. Just so it must be with us, if we would be saved under the terms of the new covenant, which provides a way of life and righteousness.

"Therefore, brethren, it is not to our lower natures that we are under obligation that we should live by their rule. For if you so live, death is near; but if, through being under the sway of the Spirit, you are putting your old bodily habits to death, you will live.

"For those who are led by God's Spirit are, all of them, God's sons. You have not for the second time acquired the consciousness of being slaves—a consciousness which fills you with terror. But you have acquired a deep inward conviction of having been adopted as sons—a conviction which prompts us to cry aloud, 'Abba! our Father!'" Rom. 8:12-15, Weymouth's "New Testament in Modern Speech."

CHAPTER XIII

THE NATURE OF MAN

IN the closing chapter of his book, Mr. Canright attacks the position held by Seventh-day Adventists on the nature of man and the punishment of the wicked. Among other things he says :

“Occasionally, here and there, along in the history of the church, men have arisen advocating the sleep of the soul and the annihilation of the wicked. But the doctrine has not met with favor, has been received by but few, has had a sickly existence, and has soon disappeared.”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*,” by D. M. Canright, pp. 397, 398.

In our reply we shall, for the sake of clarity, first give a brief résumé of what Seventh-day Adventists believe on this point, thus making Mr. Canright’s objections and our replies more understandable to the reader.

MORTALITY DEFINED

1. *Seventh-day Adventists believe that man is “mortal,” subject to death and decay.* This doctrine is based upon such Scriptural teaching as the following: “Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his Maker?” Job 4:17. Paul declares that God “only hath immortality” (see 1 Tim. 6:15, 16); and if this is true, then men are not immortal by nature. The word “immortal” appears only once in Scripture (1 Tim. 1:17), and there it is clearly applied to God, and not to men. The word “immortality” occurs five times, but in no instance is it applied to man in this natural state, but he is urged to seek for it as a treasure which may be gained through the gospel: “To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life.” Rom. 2:7.

Now, one does not seek for something which is already in his possession. If immortality were inherent in man, then surely he would have no need to strive and search for it. But God declares that immortality—eternal life—is *brought to light* “through the gospel” (2 Tim. 1:10); and this being true, then, of course, those who do not receive the gospel will never have eternal life. To this agree the words of John, who says: “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” 1 John 5:11, 12. Eternal life, or immortality, then, is a gift from God, through Christ, and is bestowed only upon those who have the Son of God. Those who receive Him receive eternal life with and through Him, but those that reject Him do not receive this life. They will never become immortal, “for the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Rom. 6:23.

2. Seventh-day Adventists believe that eternal life is received by faith at the time of conversion, but that in actuality this gift is not bestowed upon God's people until the return of Jesus. Until the resurrection day it is “hid with Christ in God.” Col. 3:3.

This is clearly taught in the Pauline letter to the Corinthian church, as follows:

“Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” 1 Cor. 15:51-54.

Note carefully the expressions: “This mortal must *put on* immortality,” and “this corruptible must *put on* incorruption.” That, then, is the time when we shall be changed from the one

state to the other. It is at the sounding of the last trumpet, when the dead are raised.

3. Seventh-day Adventists believe that during the state called death, man rests in sleep, and is entirely unconscious until he is awakened by the call of the Life-giver at the last day.

Of this doctrine there is abundance of Scriptural proof. Said Jesus to His disciples, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." John 11:11. "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." Verse 14. Of Jairus's daughter He said, "Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed Him to scorn, knowing that she was dead." Luke 8:52, 53.

"So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 14:12.

THE SLEEP OF DEATH

During this sleep of the dead there is no consciousness of mind or spirit. This is clearly set forth in the following scriptures:

"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish.*" Ps. 146:3, 4.

"In death there is no remembrance of Thee: in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?" Ps. 6:5.

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17.

"For the living know that they shall die: but *the dead know not anything*, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Eccl. 9:5, 6.

"But man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Job 14:10, 21.

It is from this unconscious state that man is called forth when Jesus comes the second time to gather His saints into His kingdom. They heed not the lapse of time. A thousand

years in the grave will seem but as an instant when the dead are raised to life again. Nor will the living have any advantage over them at the time of Christ's coming:

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [precede] them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4:13-18.

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice." John 5:28.

"Thy dead men shall live, together with My dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Isa. 26:19.

THE WICKED TO BE DESTROYED

4. Seventh-day Adventists believe that the wicked will be utterly destroyed in a literal lake of fire and brimstone; that this fire will be here upon this earth, and that it will not only burn up the wicked, but will also cleanse and purify the earth, removing all the works of man and the blemishes made by sin; and that afterward the earth will be made new and become the eternal home of the saved.

"Behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.

"But unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 4:1-3.

"Upon the wicked He shall rain snares ["quick burning coals," margin], fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup." Ps. 11:6.

"God is jealous, and the Lord revengeth; the Lord revengeth, and is furious; the Lord will take vengeance on His adversaries, and He reserveth wrath for His enemies." "Who can stand before His indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of His anger? His fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by Him. The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him. But with an overrunning flood He will make an utter end of the place thereof, and darkness shall pursue His enemies. What do ye imagine against the Lord? He will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time. For while they be folden together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, *they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry.*" Nahum 1:2, 6-10.

"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Ps. 37:20.

"I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found." Verses 35, 36.

"The wages of sin is *death.*" Rom. 6:23.

That this destruction will take place here upon the earth is clearly stated by the revelator as he portrays the fate of the wicked:

"They went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. . . . And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20:9-15.

And to this agree the words of Peter's prophecy:

"The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the ele-

ments shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Peter 3:7-13.

MR. CANRIGHT AFFIRMS NATURAL IMMORTALITY

Now, it was to these scriptures that Mr. Canright took such strong exception. He opens his attack thus:

"That man's spirit survives the death of his body and lives in a conscious state, has been so generally believed by all people in all ages that we may fairly call it universal. In this, the most barbarous and the most enlightened nations have agreed."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 395.

To this we reply that any system of error in the world could be proved in precisely the same way. If all that is required to prove a thing to be true is the fact that both barbarous and enlightened nations "have agreed" upon it, then we can find abundant proof for almost any error, from the countless myths of the heathen world to the evolutionary theory, unknown to our grandfathers, but now almost wholly eclipsing the Christian faith of two generations ago.

The majority have not usually been on the side of truth. Truth has ever been unpopular. It has always had to plead its cause against strong odds, and often in the face of bitter persecution by the masses. The broad road of error and superstition has always been well patronized, while the narrow road of truth has had only a few travelers. The fact, therefore, that both barbarous and enlightened nations have agreed upon any point of theology is far more likely to constitute a proof against that point than for it.

The church in which Mr. Canright found a home after renouncing Adventism was, only a few centuries ago, much more unpopular, and some of its doctrines were at that time more sternly denounced than are the Adventists and their doctrines today. In those days many Baptists were put to death. Some were burned at the stake in England, and many

were executed in Germany. "The most enlightened nations" were against them.

Again, Mr. Canright brings forth his arguments to prove that the wicked as well as the righteous possess immortality, and that therefore their punishment will be *eternal torment*, that the wicked dead are even now suffering this punishment, and that they will continue to suffer thus throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. Note carefully the "proof" he sets forth:

"The Apocrypha gives the views of the Jews just before the time of Christ. Here are a few verses: The wicked shall 'endure eternal torture by fire.' 4 Maccab. 9:9. 'The divine vengeance is reserving you for eternal fire and torments, which shall cling to you for all time.' Chap. 12:12. 'Let us not fear him who thinketh he killeth; for great is the trial of soul and danger of eternal torment laid up for those who transgress.' Chap. 13:14. Of the martyrs it is said: 'Through which also they now stand beside the divine throne, and live a blessed life.' Chap. 17:18. 'The children of Abraham, with their victorious mother, are assembled together to the choir of their fathers, having received pure and immortal souls from God.' Chap. 18:23. 'The tyrant Antiochus was both punished upon earth and is punished now he is dead.' Verse 5."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," pp. 395, 396.*

WITNESSES IMPEACHED

Now we shall have to admit that these are pretty strong texts that Mr. Canright has cited. They appear to make out a strong case for the eternal-torture idea. "The wicked shall 'endure eternal torture by fire,'" "eternal fire and torments, which shall cling to you for all time," etc. Also he finds a text which speaks of people as "having received *pure and immortal* souls from God." No wonder some one called this book of Mr. Canright's a "dumfounder" for the Adventists! We are not, however, so much dumfounded over these texts as we are over the fact that a Christian, Protestant minister should resort to them for proof of Christian doctrine! At that we *are* "dumfounded."

Will the reader kindly take his Bible just here, and turn to these texts cited by Mr. Canright? What? Can't find them?

Why, yes, just turn to 4 Maccabees, chapter 9, verse 9. Not in your Bible? Well! well! Strange, isn't it? The writer has had the same difficulty. This book of Maccabees is not in his Bible either. What, then, shall we conclude from this fact? Just this, that Mr. Canright had "another Bible just the same as the Mormons have." (See his charge against Adventists, in "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 136.)

Mr. Canright's appeal to the Apocrypha shows the desperate straits he was in to prove his contention. The Apocrypha is not recognized by Protestants as of any authority whatever in matters of Christian doctrine, and 4 Maccabees is not recognized even by Catholics. The "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia" says of this book, that it is "absent from the Vulgate, and therefore from the Romanist canon and from the Protestant versions." Not only did Mr. Canright have another Bible, but, as we have seen, he made it himself, admitting to it anything from any source that he could use to discredit that which he himself had so zealously taught for twenty-eight years.

But why did he turn to the Apocrypha instead of to the Bible? We answer, Because he could get no help from the Bible. It is not on his side. Its teachings are exactly contrary to his theory. Therefore it became a pressing necessity that he find proof elsewhere, so he turns to the Apocrypha. He has "another Bible." It says what he wants it to say. Almost any spurious doctrine can be found there, and it was to these uninspired books that Mr. Canright turned for proof of an eternally burning hell and the natural immortality of the soul.

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH

The Scriptural teaching concerning the punishment of the wicked is that they shall *die*. "The wages of sin is *death*." Rom. 6:23. Now, death is not life, but is the opposite of life. To die is to cease to live. To die, therefore, does not mean an eternal conscious existence in hell, but eternal extinction. The wicked are to be "cut off," "cut down," consumed into

smoke; pass away so that they cannot be found; burned up "root and branch," reduced to "ashes," burned up as "stubble fully dry," and to be as though they had not been. (See Obadiah 15, 16; Ps. 37:9, 20, 22; Mal. 4:1-3.) How any one could possibly read eternal torture into such expressions as these, we cannot tell.

Nor can this everlasting-torment doctrine be harmonized with the statement that "God is love." True, God will punish the wicked, and they will have to pay to the uttermost farthing for their rebellion and sins; but even the wrath of God against sin has a limit. Only a fiend would punish a human being in a caldron of fire and brimstone throughout the eternal ages, reckoning that his sins committed during a short lifetime merited such severity. Only a fiend could endure the horrible sight of the damned roasting and writhing in hell, and enjoy the foul miasma of such a plague spot, where the wicked were continually cursing and blaspheming God because of their agonies in hell.

"What do ye imagine against the Lord? *He will make an utter end: affliction [or sin] shall not rise up the second time. For while they be folden together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry.*" Nahum 1:9, 10.

God has declared that sin shall be destroyed forever, that the earth shall be purified with fire, and that it shall come forth new and clean again from the hand of the Creator. It shall be clothed with the beauty of Eden once more.

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them [the saved]; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees." Isa. 35:1-3.

God will have a clean universe again. He will not permit sin and sinners to mar it forever. He will not rope off a sec-

tion somewhere in His kingdom to which He may turn at times for diversion, where the wicked are to be kept writhing in hell. God is not a fiend, that He should take pleasure in such things. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God." Eze. 18:32. It is God's express purpose that the wicked shall be cut off, and that the meek shall inherit the earth. (See Ps. 37:2, 11.)

HOW CAN THE WICKED LIVE ETERNALLY?

Paul declares that "the gift of God is eternal life." Rom. 6:23. But what about the wicked who do not receive this gift? How shall they live eternally in hell if they do not have everlasting life? Obviously it would require a greater manifestation of God's power to keep the wicked alive in a roaring, burning, seething hell than to perpetuate the lives of the righteous in heaven, where they are given access to the tree of life. But the wicked do not have God's gift of life. They must therefore die, and their death will be eternal.

From the second death men will never come forth to live again. They are "cut off;" they are reduced to ashes; they have ceased to be; they are as though they never had been. Then, and only then, can John's prophecy be fulfilled, in which he said:

"Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. 5:13.

All through Mr. Canright's chapter on this subject, he advances the idea that the spirit of man has an existence and entity separate from the body, and that the spirit goes immediately to its reward at death. In commenting on the experience of the thief who was converted on the cross, he says:

"Jesus plainly said, 'Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise.' If he went to Paradise that day, then all Christians go there at

death. His body did not go to Paradise, for it was buried. Hence his spirit did live and go there."—"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 404.

The statement made by Jesus to the thief has long been used by immortal-soul advocates to prove that men go to their reward at death. "Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." Luke 23:43.

Now, of course, the thief could not be *with Jesus* in Paradise that day unless Jesus Himself was there. And the Bible record clearly reveals that Jesus did not go to Paradise on the day of His crucifixion, for He said to Mary on the morning of His resurrection, three days later: "Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father: but go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God." John 20:17. Of course, no one will dispute that Paradise is the place where God dwells; and therefore here is clear testimony from Jesus to the effect that He had not yet visited this place when He appeared to Mary near the empty tomb.

What, then, shall we conclude from this? Just this: that Jesus did not promise the thief that he would go to Paradise that day. In fact, the thief did not ask that. He said to Jesus, "Lord, remember me *when Thou comest* into Thy kingdom." Luke 23:42. Not when Thou *goest*, but when Thou *comest*. This is quite different. Daniel tells us that Jesus comes into, or receives, His kingdom at the time of the judgment:

"The judgment was set, and the books were opened. . . . I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7:10-14.

This, then, is the time the thief asked to be remembered, and not on the crucifixion day. It was in the day of the resur-

rection that he did not want to be forgotten. The answer Jesus gave to this dying man's request becomes as clear as day if, when reading it, we just place the comma after the word "today" instead of the word "thee." It then reads thus: "Verily I say unto thee today, shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

Joseph Bryand Rotherham, in his "Emphasized New Testament," renders this text thus:

"Jesus! remember me whensoever Thou shalt come into Thy kingdom. And He said unto him, Verily I say unto thee this day: With Me shalt thou be in Paradise."—*Printed at London, 1903.*

The use of the phrase "today" in a sentence for emphasis is common in the Bible. (See Zech. 9:12; Deut. 8:19; 26:16-18; 30:15, 16, 18, 19; 11:26-28.)

It was the *promise* that was made that day. "Verily I say unto thee today." Yes, *today*, when I am hanging here with you on the cross, when everything appears hopeless and men and devils think they have silenced Me forever; *today* I make you the solemn promise that you shall be with Me in Paradise. But just *when* the repentant thief would be with Jesus in Paradise the Saviour did not say. This point was already clear in the thief's mind. It was to be when Jesus should come into possession of His glorious kingdom and come to ransom His people. That is when all the saved will go to Paradise together, and the thief will be among them. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27.

The idea that men go to their reward at death—the righteous to heaven and the wicked to hell—is entirely inconsistent with many other Bible texts. For example, the Bible clearly teaches that there will be a final judgment, a time in the end of the world when the cases of all men will be tried. It is clearly stated that the purpose of this judgment is to determine what rewards shall be given the people who have lived upon the earth. Thus Paul declares: "We must all appear before the

judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10.

But if the rewards are to follow the judgment, and if the judgment is to be at the "time of the end," how, then, is it possible for men to go to their reward at death? Will these people who have been sent to the respective places be recalled and judged to determine where they should be sent? Will Abel have to come down out of heaven and Cain up out of hell, and wait for the Judge to determine what their reward should be? If so, is there some possibility that, after the judgment, some will have to exchange places because it is found that a mistake had been made in the place of their consignment? Such questions sound foolish, and yet this is exactly what might happen if men went to their reward prior to the time of final judgment.

MR. CANRIGHT QUOTES JOSEPHUS

In a desperate effort to find some support for this doctrine that people receive their reward at death, Mr. Canright departs from the Bible and quotes Josephus, the Jewish historian, as follows:

"Of another Jewish sect, the Essenes, he says: 'They teach the immortality of souls.'—*Antiq.*, book 18, chap. 1. Further: 'Their doctrine is that bodies are corruptible and that the matter they are made of is not permanent; but that the souls are immortal and continue forever; and that they come out of the most subtle air, and are united to their bodies as to prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement. But that when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount upwards.'"—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 306.

Surely this reasoning is very profound! Souls are immortal. They come out of the air, and are enticed into human bodies. When they get in, they discover that they are in prison. "When they are set free from the bonds of the flesh [at death], they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount

upwards"! But the most tragic part of it all is that these poor liberated souls do not seem to realize, when they fly away so quickly and happily, that their release from the prison is only temporary. If they knew about the resurrection of the body, which is to take place at the coming of Christ, no doubt their rejoicing would be somewhat modified. What, we wonder, would happen if some of them were enjoying their liberty so well at the time of the resurrection that they refused to go back to the prison of the body? Would there then be some spirits without bodies and some bodies without spirits?

Surely it is clear to every one that this doctrine of a separate, intelligent, conscious existence of the soul apart from the body is contrary both to the gospel and to common sense. If there is to be a resurrection of the body, then the soul, or spirit, of man does not enter upon the enjoyment of its reward at death.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS

For further proof of his contention Mr. Canright cites the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, which he quotes and comments upon in the following manner:

"See the same doctrine so definitely taught in the case of the rich man and Lazarus. Luke 16:19-31. 'And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said

Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.' . . .

"These events occurred between death and the resurrection, while the brethren of the rich man were yet alive on earth. Hence immediately after death and before the resurrection the rich man is in hell and Lazarus is rewarded. They are both conscious. Abraham is alive over there. Both think and talk. Hence the dead certainly know something. Had we no other text, this alone would disprove the sleep of the dead."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," pp. 406, 407.

In arguing against Spiritualism on page 398 of "*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," Mr. Canright states:

"Further, the Bible forbids seeking to the dead, and states plainly that they know nothing of things on the earth. (See Deut. 18:9-12; Job 14:21; Eccl. 9:5, 6; Luke 16:19-31.)"

We beg the reader to note carefully the contradiction here. In one place Mr. Canright says that the Bible states plainly that the dead know nothing of things on the earth, and he cites four Scriptural references to prove it. In another place he takes a parable as though it were a literal happening, says the things in it "occurred between death and the resurrection," has the dead in heaven and in hell talking together about five brothers of the rich man who are still on earth, and closes by observing, "Hence the dead certainly know something." In one place the dead "know nothing of things on the earth;" in the other place a dead man in hell carries on a perfectly rational conversation about five brothers of his who are still upon the earth! Perhaps Mr. Canright's admirers who circulate his book so freely will also want to smooth this glaring contradiction up a bit before the next edition is published. It really needs it. It looks bad as it is.

Will you, dear reader, try to picture in your mind what heaven would be like, and how much enjoyment you could get out of being there, if this parable of our Lord's were to be taken as an indication of actual conditions existing there between death and the resurrection? Lazarus is in heaven, the rich man in hell; and Abraham is seen holding Lazarus in his

bosom. The rich man and Lazarus decide to have a visit together. Really, these two places must be in pretty close proximity to each other. The inmates can converse freely. A saintly mother in heaven can visit now and then with her wayward son who is in hell. She can hear his cries and entreaties for mercy. She puts him off, saying that he had a good time on earth and now he must be tormented. This goes on for a year, two years, ten years, a hundred years, and the mother realizes that it must continue to all eternity! *Can any one possibly imagine such a state of things existing in heaven, where the redeemed are promised "pleasures forevermore"?*

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus was not given to teach the conscious state of man during death. This parable was to serve as a rebuke to covetousness and self-righteousness. Just before Luke records it he says:

"No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else we will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. . . . And He said unto them [the Pharisees], Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Luke 16:13-15.

Those haughty Pharisees thought the fact that they had succeeded in accumulating riches was evidence of God's favor. No matter if they got it by grinding down the poor and suffering, refusing them even the crumbs that fell from their tables. Let the poor suffer; it only showed that the curse of God was upon them. None of these things mattered to the Pharisees. If they were rich,—as the most of them evidently were,—then they felt sure of heaven.

It was this spirit that Jesus sought to rebuke by the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. He was teaching that riches make no difference with God—are no evidence whatever of His love. The rich man is no surer of heaven than is the beggar who lies at his gate. God is no respecter of persons. The poorest widow in the slums is as dear to His heart as is the

king in his palace. It is character alone which counts with God, and not worldly possessions.

This parable shows clearly that in the future the cases of many will be entirely reversed from what they have been in this life. Then the first shall be last and the last first. Many of those who have filled their coffers here and have had all that heart could wish, but who have forgotten God and been disobedient to His law, will be consigned to the fate of the enemies of God. Also many of those who have been poor in this world's goods, who have felt the pinch of want and the pangs of hunger, who have suffered from cold and nakedness, but who have been faithful in their obligations to God, will in that day be made kings and priests unto God, and will reign with Him forever. Many a person who spent his last days in the almshouse will then be exalted above those who lived in king's palaces.

In God's estimation no man is valued by what he possesses. All that men have is lent them of the Lord, and a misuse of these gifts places the richest of the rich below the poorest sufferer who reveres God and loves his fellow men.

Also Christ taught by this parable that after death there is no further probation for the sinner. The rich man is represented as seeking for mercy after death, but he is told that a great impassable gulf has now been fixed. If during this life no provision is made for eternity by acceptance of the gospel, at death it becomes forever too late. The gospel commission is limited to this life. All preparation for eternity must be made this side of the grave. After death the gulf is fixed, and no one can pass over.

Christ was also teaching in this parable that those who were lost would be altogether without excuse. God has made full and abundant provision for the salvation of every man who desires to be saved.

The rich man is represented as saying :

"I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Luke 16:27, 28.

But:

"Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Verses 29-31.

Thus the rich man is represented as suggesting that if men only had additional light, they would be more likely to do right and avail themselves of the plan of salvation. But the answer is given concerning those who refuse the light of God's word found in Moses and the prophets, that any additional evidence would be of no avail. Even though one rose from the dead to carry to them a message of warning, they would still not believe.

God has done all that infinite love could do to save lost men from sin. He asks: "What could have been done more to My vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Isa. 5:4.

No one therefore will be able to rise up in the judgment and justly claim that he was lost because of any failure on God's part. Every lost man will be entirely without excuse. If he has rejected the light shining from the word of God, there is no clearer light that can be given, and he proves himself unworthy of eternal life.

It evidently was to make these truths plain that this amazing parable was spoken, and not to teach that people go to heaven or hell as soon as they die, and that they are such close neighbors that they can converse with each other. (Compare this parable with Judges 9:7-15. Here the trees are represented as talking, but surely no one would say because of this that all trees actually have the gift of speech.)

It has already been shown that this parable could not possibly apply literally to conditions existing between death and

the resurrection. During that time the dead are asleep; their thoughts have perished, and they know not anything. They have no portion "in anything that is done under the sun." During this time, therefore, the righteous and the wicked dead cannot see one another or talk together. They do not enter into their reward until after the resurrection from the dead.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

At the second coming of Jesus the "first resurrection" will take place, and at this time all the righteous dead will be brought to life again. It is only the "blessed and holy," those that "sleep in Jesus," who will have a part in this resurrection. (See Rev. 20:6; 1 Thess. 4:13-16.) These resurrected saints, together with the righteous who are still living upon the earth, will then be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and will be escorted by Jesus and the holy angels to the mansions of glory. (See 1 Thess. 4:17; John 14:1-3.)

But at this time all the rest of the dead, the wicked of earth, who have died in ages past, remain in their graves; and they are joined there by the wicked who were alive upon the earth at the appearing of Jesus and who are destroyed by the bright glory of His presence. (See 2 Thess. 2:8.) They have no part in the first resurrection, but will have to wait for the second.

These two resurrections will be a thousand years apart, according to Revelation 20:1-5; and during this interval, which constitutes the millennium, Satan is bound here upon the earth by a great chain of circumstances. The righteous are all gone where they are forever beyond his power, and the wicked are all still in death. Of them it is written:

"The slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." Jer. 25:33.

Satan will have this time in which to meditate upon the results of his rebellion against the law and government of God. He is shut up in this awful death house, this "bottomless pit," from which he cannot escape. During this thousand years the righteous will join Christ and the angels in the work of judging the wicked dead and the fallen angels. So far, only those who had at some time in life accepted the plan of salvation, have been judged. Now the life records of the others must be investigated and punishments determined upon. In this work the righteous will all have a part.

"Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?" 1 Cor. 6:2, 3.

When this work of judgment is completed, at the end of the thousand years, Jesus will return once more to the earth. This time He will be accompanied by the saints, and will bring with Him the city of God, the New Jerusalem, in which are the mansions which Jesus has gone to prepare. (See John 14:2, 3.) "The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with Thee." Zech. 14:5.

John beheld this scene in holy vision, and exclaimed:

"I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." "And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; and had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel." "And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass." "And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it." Rev. 21:2, 10-12, 18, 22-24.

It is at this time that the wicked dead will be raised to life again. Thus far they have suffered only the natural death which has been the common lot of both saints and sinners because of inherited mortality, and now the wicked must be brought to life that they may suffer the "second death," which is the wages of their sin. John declares: "The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Rev. 20:5. But now Jesus calls them to life. The revelator describes them as being "as the sand of the sea" for multitude. Rev. 20:8. They have traveled the broad way, the popular route; and they awake to find themselves still with the crowd. Among them are the rich and the poor, the kings and the paupers, the bond and the free of earth who, during their lifetime, rejected God's plan for saving the lost race. They are all there.

As this mighty multitude of lost ones look up and behold the holy city, New Jerusalem, descending from heaven to earth, they are seized with consternation, and "flee to the valley of the mountains" in an effort to hide from the face of Jesus and the redeemed host who accompany the city. (See Zech. 14:4, 5, 11.) Self-condemned, they feel that they cannot look upon the face of their Lord, whose mercy they have rejected.

Satan, however, who is now loosed out of his prison (by the fact that the wicked are now living again and he can continue to practice his work of deception), rallies these forces, and begins to organize them for battle. Revelation 20:8 indicates that the great adversary deceives them into believing that what they have apparently lost by rejecting the gospel they can, under his leadership, now gain by force. Surely they have the advantage of superior numbers. Why should they not capture this city, and make it the capital of a great empire?

Thus the matter is settled. They agree upon a course of action, and prepare for battle. They begin the march against the city. But let us permit John the revelator to describe the scene as it was shown to him in vision:

“When the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city.” Rev. 20:7-9.

Foretelling this scene, Jesus Himself declared: “There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.” Luke 13:28. This is when the wicked will plead for mercy, but will find that it is now too late.

The day of grace ends with the second advent of Jesus. The door of mercy is then no longer ajar. The loving invitation of the Spirit, calling, “Whosoever will, let him come,” is then no longer heard. To their entreaties Jesus replies:

“Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out My hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all My counsel, and would none of My reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon Me, but I will not answer; they shall seek Me early, but they shall not find Me: for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord: they would none of My counsel: they despised all My reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices.” Prov. 1:24-31.

It is at this time that every knee shall bow to Christ, and every tongue shall confess to God. (See Rom. 14:11.) But for the wicked, this confession is to no avail. It serves only as an acknowledgment of the justice of their punishment. It proves that in rejecting them as citizens of His kingdom, the Judge of all the earth has done right. They are condemned upon the strength of their own testimony.

It was this time of which Paul wrote when he declared: “We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according

to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10. They do not gather here to be judged, but to hear the sentence that has already been prepared, and to suffer its execution. This will be the final meeting of the families of earth. Never again will the righteous and the wicked look upon one another's faces. God will make an utter end of sin and sinners, so that His universe may be clean.

HELL-FIRE

And when the time for that destruction has come, God by His power converts the water in the streams into pitch and the dust of the earth into brimstone, and then fire begins to rain from heaven. The earth also is melted, thus forming a bottomless lake of fire which will compass the entire earth. And in this the devil, his angels, and all the wicked perish, and the earth is cleansed from sin's defilement. Note how clearly the following scriptures set forth these truths:

"They went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone." "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20:9, 10, 13-15.

"Behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in His wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 4:1-3.

This, then, is the end of the wicked, and of Satan. They are reduced to ashes. They are utterly annihilated. They are cut off. They are punished with "everlasting destruction from

the presence of the Lord" (2 Thess. 1:9), but that punishment is *everlasting death*. It is everlasting in its effects. From the second death there is no resurrection. The punishment therefore is eternal. It is *eternal death*. Not that they will be eternally dying and yet never die, but they are to be eternally dead. They will never see life again. They are to be "as though they had not been." Obadiah 16.

This, then, is hell. Peter speaks of this terrible fire which shall melt and purify the earth as being the "perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:7. It is a hell 25,000 miles in circumference. It is hot enough to melt the earth and utterly consume the wicked. God has decreed that those upon this earth who follow Satan in his rebellious course against God and His law, must also share the fate that awaits him in this caldron of fire. If men refuse salvation, God has no alternative but to destroy them; for sin must be eradicated and the kingdom of God be made safe for His people.

After the fire has done its work and the curse of sin has thus been entirely removed, the fire will go out. The earth will be left a total wreck, but it will be clean. Then the great Creator will once more reveal His power by making an entirely new earth out of the ruins of the old one. Says the apostle:

"The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." "Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Peter 3:10, 13.

"He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new." "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea." Rev. 21:5, 1.

Then "the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Ps. 37:11.

CHAPTER XIV

THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

MR. CANRIGHT strenuously objects, in Chapter VII of his book, to the teaching of the Seventh-day Adventists regarding the judgment and the cleansing of the sanctuary. He brands it as "fanaticism," and holds it up to public ridicule. As in his treatment of many other subjects, he freely misstates the Seventh-day Adventist position, and confuses the issue in the mind of the reader by making false charges against some of the former leaders of that church. He says in his first paragraph that this is an important issue, and urges his readers to study into it carefully.

In order to aid in the careful study of this subject, we present in the following pages a brief statement of the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventists on the subject of the cleansing of the sanctuary and its relation to the judgment and the law of God.

TWO SANCTUARIES

In the Bible two sanctuaries of God are spoken of. One is called the earthly tabernacle, one the heavenly. One was built by Moses in the wilderness, and the other was built by God in heaven. One was only a type; the other, the antitype, or true tabernacle. The services of the tabernacle on earth were performed by the members of the Aaronic priesthood; those of the heavenly, by Jesus Christ, who is our High Priest. Heb. 8:1, 2. In the earthly sanctuary the blood of animals was offered daily as a type of the sacrifice of Christ, who had promised to become the sinner's substitute. In the heavenly,

Jesus presents His own blood as the sacrificial atonement for the sins of His people.

Of the earthly tabernacle the Lord said to Moses:

“Let them make Me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.” “And thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee.” “And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.” Ex. 25:8, 9, 16, 21, 22.

And after carefully instructing Moses how to make certain other furnishings, such as altars, table, candlestick, etc., he added: “Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount.” Verse 40.

Of the heavenly sanctuary we read:

“Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such a High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this Man have somewhat also to offer. For if He were on earth, He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.” Heb. 8:1-5.

Thus it is clearly revealed that there were two sanctuaries, an earthly (or, as rendered in Hebrews 9:1, A. R. V., “a sanctuary of the world”), and a heavenly. The “sanctuary of the world” was a type of the heavenly, and its services were only “the example and shadow of heavenly things.” The heavenly is “*the true tabernacle*, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” The high priests in the earthly sanctuary offered “gifts and sacrifices,” and it was necessary that Christ, the Priest of the heavenly sanctuary, “have somewhat also to offer.”

The sanctuary of this world, with its typical services, was only a temporary arrangement made by God, by which to teach the people the great fundamental truth of the gospel; i. e., that remission of sins is essential to eternal life, and can be secured only through the shed blood of the Lamb of God, who would die as a ransom for men, and whose death was typified by the blood of animals. This temporary typical arrangement was to continue only until the death of Jesus, after which time it would have no further meaning, since it was simply a shadow of the cross. Thus we read:

“The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come a High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” Heb. 9:8-14.

Here we see that Paul refers to the sanctuary in the wilderness as “the first tabernacle.” Hence there must have been a second.

The first “was a figure for *the time then present.*” Its service was “imposed on them until the time of reformation,”—the opening of the gospel dispensation.

Christ is stated to be a “High Priest of . . . *a greater and more perfect tabernacle.*” He ministers not “the blood of goats and calves,” but “His own blood.”

“Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary” (Heb. 9:1), but Christ is a minister of a “more perfect tabernacle.” Verse 11.

There can be no question, therefore, that the Bible clearly reveals two distinct sanctuaries of God, one of which is the true, and of which the other was a type, or shadow.

THE SANCTUARY IN HEAVEN

Some claim that all heaven is the sanctuary, but that teaching clearly contradicts the plain statements of Scripture. Paul speaks of the second as a heavenly sanctuary, but that does not mean that it is heaven itself. Heaven is not the sanctuary, but the sanctuary is *in* heaven. This is very definitely revealed in Revelation 11:19, which says, "The temple of God was opened in heaven." He does not say heaven was opened, but the temple of God was opened in heaven. This temple is the sanctuary, for he says there was seen in it the ark of the testament.

In Hebrews 9:23 it is very definitely stated that the earthly sanctuary was a pattern "of things *in* the heavens"—not a pattern of *heaven*, but of *things in the heavens*. The heavenly sanctuary, therefore, is located in heaven, and is called the true and more perfect tabernacle, as compared with the one that was upon earth.

A study of the heavenly sanctuary shows us that it is furnished in the same way as was the earthly. In Revelation 1:12 John speaks of seeing the candlesticks in the heavenly sanctuary; in Revelation 11:19 he sees the ark of the testimony; and in Revelation 8:3 he sees the altar of incense and the golden censer. In Hebrews 8:4, 5, we are told that the earthly sanctuary was built after a pattern, and that it was a "shadow of heavenly things." If that is true, then the shadow that was on the earth must of necessity reveal what is in heaven; in essential arrangements the two must be the same. Also the typical services performed in the earthly must find their anti-type in the heavenly. In this way only could the earthly be a shadow of the heavenly.

TWO APARTMENTS

The earthly sanctuary was divided into two apartments,—the holy place and the most holy. At the entrance to the first apartment, or room, was a linen veil or curtain. Between the two apartments or rooms was a second veil, separating the first apartment, or holy place, from the second, or most holy place; as it is written: "The veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy." Ex. 26:33.

This division of the sanctuary into two apartments was absolutely essential for the performance of the typical service. The respective work performed in the two had a very different meaning. The service in the first apartment typified the bringing of confessed sins into the sanctuary, while that of the second apartment had to do with their removal. Without the service in the first apartment, the service in the second would have no meaning. If the sins of the people were not first brought into the sanctuary through the daily ministration, there could of course be no cleansing or removal of sins on the Day of Atonement.

Now since the earthly sanctuary was a shadow cast by the heavenly, and since in the earthly there were two apartments, there must necessarily be two apartments in the heavenly. A single shaft, with one source of light, cannot cast a double shadow. Just so a sanctuary in heaven having only one room, could never cast a shadow upon earth with two. And further, a heavenly sanctuary in which the priestly service was performed in only one room, could not be typified by the service of a sanctuary with two rooms, where the services of the respective rooms had an altogether different meaning. If in the heavenly there be no first apartment service, then the entire typical service of the first apartment had no meaning, and finds no antitype in the work of our High Priest in heaven. Such a conclusion is unthinkable. It would destroy with one stroke the significance of the entire typical service.

In Hebrews 9:8 we learn that there was no priestly service performed in the heavenly sanctuary until the earthly had come to its close: "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Christ therefore was not ministering in the heavenly sanctuary before He came to the earth. The services in the earthly had to come to a close, and the priesthood had to be changed from the sons of Aaron to Christ, before the way was open for services to begin in the sanctuary in heaven.

The offering of animals in the earthly sanctuary was an expression of faith on the part of the people that Jesus, the Lamb of God, would come and die to redeem them from sin. Therefore, the moment Jesus died on the cross the shadow met the substance, and the typical service lost its meaning. From that time on, that service could no longer point forward to the death of Christ.

The death of Jesus took place at the hour of the evening sacrifice, and in Jerusalem the priest was busy with this service. The lamb for the evening offering had been brought, but just at that moment Jesus expired on the cross and the veil of the temple was rent in twain. Thus God indicated that the glory of His presence had departed from the earthly temple, and that the efficacy of the types and shadows had suddenly come to an end.

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:14-17.

Thus the law of the earthly priesthood, the law of the meat offerings and drink offerings, the law concerning yearly sabbaths and holy days, with the whole typical service, was nailed to the

cross. When the nails pierced the hands and feet of Jesus and His blood flowed, the blood of the sacrificial lamb had no further meaning. The time had come of which Jesus spoke to the woman of Samaria at the well when He said: "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." John 4:21. They could worship God now by going straight to Jesus, their Advocate and High Priest, for the way into the heavenly sanctuary was made manifest. He had taken away the first that He might establish the second. (See Heb. 10:8, 9.)

CHRIST NOT A PRIEST BEFORE HE CAME TO EARTH

Christ was not a priest before He came to the earth. Therefore He was not performing a priestly service in the heavenly sanctuary before that time. His priesthood could not begin until the priesthood of Aaron had closed. It was this changing of the priesthood that made necessary the abolition of the ceremonial law which governed the priestly ministry. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. 7:12.

Before Christ could serve as priest, it was necessary that He should have an offering to present to God. Said the apostle: "Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this Man have somewhat also to offer." Heb. 8:3. Christ shed His blood that He might have something to offer. The earthly priest offered the blood of animals, but He came not to offer the blood of bulls and goats and lambs, but to offer His own blood; therefore His priestly service could not begin until after His blood had been shed.

Paul very definitely tells us that the earthly priests were taken from among the people whom they were to serve, in order that they might have compassion on the people and understand their infirmities.

“Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.” Heb. 5:1, 2.

Thus the priests were not brought in from some distant part of the world, from some nation which did not understand the needs and sufferings of the people whom they would serve, but they were taken from among their brethren.

Paul tells us that this was true also of Christ. Before He could serve as a priest on man’s behalf, He must Himself become a man.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted.” Heb. 2:14-18.

“We have not a High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.” Heb. 4:15, 16.

Thus in all things He was made like His brethren. Why? That He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest. Therefore, Christ was not a priest until after He had become man and had suffered on man’s behalf.

Why do we emphasize this point? For the reason that this shows conclusively that all the priestly work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary has had to be performed since the cross. None of it was done before He came to earth. In the earthly sanctuary the priest served in the first apartment and then in the second apartment, and the service was an example, or type, of the service of Christ. Therefore Christ must serve

in both the first and second apartments of the heavenly sanctuary, and His service in both these apartments must come after the cross. The priest served first in the first apartment. Therefore, if the types mean anything to us, they show that when Christ went to heaven as a priest, He began His service in the first apartment, whereas His ministry in the second apartment was to come at a subsequent time.

Now the work in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary required a much longer period than the work in the second. Day by day throughout the year the priest ministered in the holy place, and one day in the year he ministered in the most holy. So if we follow that in the antitype in heaven, we conclude that it was necessary that Christ should go first into the first apartment, and that He should serve a much longer period there than He would afterward serve in the most holy place.

TYPES NOT FOUND IN THE MELCHISEDEC PRIESTHOOD

Some argue that the types of Christ's priestly ministry are not to be found in the Levitical priesthood, but in the Melchisedec priesthood. But we inquire, Where is the record of Melchisedec's priestly ministry? What kind of sacrifices did he offer? What was the order of the services performed? If the types are to be found in his priestly service, it is important that we understand them, in order that we may also understand the work of Christ, the antitype. But we find no record of the priestly ministry of Melchisedec. We find no shedding of blood, no offering of sacrifices, no work of atonement. But we do find all this set forth in the work of the Levitical priests. In their ministry every detail of the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is clearly taught. If we reject the Levitical priesthood, we are left entirely without a typical ministration. If we accept it, we have a typical service which teaches every principle essential of the plan of redemption.

We are left in no uncertainty on this important point. In speaking of Christ, Paul declares: "If He were on earth, He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Heb. 8:4, 5. Thus it is the service of the priests who served *under the law* that is to be taken as an example of the work of Christ in heaven. These were the Levites. They were designated as priests by the law of Moses. Their gifts were offered according to the law that governed the ceremonial service, and here Paul definitely declares their service to be "the example and shadow of heavenly things." The types of Christ in His priestly service are found only in them.

But in what respect, then, was Christ a priest after the order of Melchisedec? Heb. 7:21. Just this: Melchisedec was not a priest under the law of Moses. He did not become a priest by inheritance. He was "without father, without mother, and without descent" (margin, "pedigree") (Heb. 7:3); that is, he could not trace his genealogy to the tribe of Levi, and thus prove that he was a priest by inheritance. The sons of Aaron were priests because their father was priest. It was an inheritance. But Melchisedec became a priest in another way.

Just so it was with Christ. He was not of the tribe of Levi, but sprang out of Judah. By the law He had no inheritance in the priestly ministry. He was without priestly parentage or pedigree.

"He of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another Priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Heb. 7:13-16.

Jesus was made a priest by an oath of God, for the Scripture says, "Not without an oath He was made priest." Heb. 7:

20. It was this change that made necessary a change of the law which designated that the Levites should be the priests; "for the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law;" "for the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forevermore." Heb. 7:12, 28. In this respect therefore Christ was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, but the types of Christ's ministration in His capacity as High Priest are found only in the Levitical service.

In view of these considerations we must therefore urge again that since the earthly priest performed his first service in the first apartment of the sanctuary, which consumed the greater part of his time and labor, so must Christ begin His ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and continue there a much longer period than that required for His service in the second. And since the service of the earthly priests in the most holy place came at the end of the yearly round, so must Christ's work in the second apartment come at the close of His priestly ministry, and not at the beginning. He could not therefore, upon His ascension to heaven, have entered immediately upon His work in the most holy place, for His work in the first apartment had not yet been performed.

WITHIN THE VEIL

Some one may say, Did not Christ go immediately within the veil? Certainly He did. This is clearly stated in Hebrews 6:19, 20: "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the Forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a High Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

But does this prove that He went immediately into the most holy place? If there were only one veil in the sanctuary, then it might seem to indicate that He did, but there were two veils.

In Hebrews 9:3 Paul says distinctly that there is a second veil. "After the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all."

The fact that there were two veils is also clearly set forth in Exodus 26:31-36:

"Thou shalt make a veil of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cunning work: with cherubim shall it be made: and thou shalt hang it upon four pillars of shittim wood overlaid with gold: their hooks shall be of gold, upon the four sockets of silver. And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. And thou shalt put the mercy seat upon the ark of the testimony in the most holy place. And thou shalt set the table without the veil, and the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle toward the south: and thou shalt put the table on the north side. And thou shalt make a hanging for the door of the tent, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, wrought with needlework."

One of these cloth hangings was at the entrance to the first apartment, and the other served as a dividing veil between the two rooms. When Paul refers to the dividing veil, he calls it "the second veil;" but when he refers to the first veil, he just says "the veil." Therefore, when he declared that Christ had gone within the veil, he of course meant into the first apartment, beyond the first veil. He did not say He had gone through two veils, nor did he say He had gone within the second veil. Therefore, when Christ went to heaven and passed within the veil, it was to begin His ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

John tells us very definitely in Revelation 1:12, 13, that he saw Christ ministering in the place where the golden candlesticks are: "I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle." The candlesticks were in the first apartment, and it is here that John definitely declares that Christ was

THE THRONE OF GOD

In Hebrews 8:1 we are told that our High Priest is "set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." Some argue that this constitutes evidence that Christ went immediately into the most holy place, since it is presumed that the throne of God is there, and that it corresponds to the ark of the earthly sanctuary. But we do not find that the ark is called God's throne, but find very clear indications that the throne of God is movable, that it moves about from place to place as need requires, being conveyed by living creatures who are capable of moving about with the swiftness of lightning. (See Ezekiel 1.)

We also know that the throne of God must be movable from what Daniel tells us in chapter 7:9, 10, of his prophecy. Here he describes the beginning of the work of judgment. He says: "I beheld until the *thrones were placed* [margin], and the Ancient of days did sit." This indicates that God would move His throne when the time should come for the opening of the judgment. In Revelation 4:2, 5, it is recorded that John saw the throne in the first apartment of the sanctuary, for he says he beheld it in the place where the seven lamps were.

Thus it seems that the throne of God moves about whither God wishes to go, and therefore, wherever God is, the throne is present. He is not limited to one little corner. As King Solomon said in his prayer to God when he dedicated the temple in Jerusalem: "Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee; how much less this house that I have builded." 1 Kings 8:27. When we are told, therefore, that Christ sat down on the throne at the time of His ascension, that should not be taken to mean that He went at that time into the most holy place of the sanctuary; for we learn from a careful study of the sure word of prophecy that God did not occupy the throne in the most holy place of the sanctuary until the time

CHRIST'S MINISTRY IN THE FIRST APARTMENT

What was the work of Christ in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary? Was there anything for Him to do there? We answer: Jesus' ministry in the first apartment was to plead the merits of His righteousness and of His shed blood in behalf of sinners in the earth who had and who should yet accept Him. He had extended the invitation, "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth," and it was only through the ministry of His blood that He was able thus to save.

In 1 John 2:1 Jesus is said to be our "advocate." In Romans 3:34 Paul states that He "maketh intercession for us." John the revelator sees Him in the holy place before the golden altar, offering up incense with the prayers of the saints; and Jesus Himself declared that He would confess before His Father those who confessed Him before men. (See Matt. 10:32.)

This, then, was His work in the first apartment of the sanctuary. As sinners came to God for pardon and would plead the shed blood of Jesus on their behalf, Jesus became their Advocate and made intercession for them before God. He offered up their prayers with sweet incense before the Father, and pleaded that since His blood had been shed on behalf of sinners, and since these had accepted Him as their sacrifice, they might receive pardon. Yea, more, He offered to take away the guilt of their sin, and to impute to them His life of righteousness. Thus by accepting Jesus as their substitute and sacrifice, the sins of the sinners were transferred from themselves to the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ was ministering, and where the sins would remain until the investigative judgment, when they finally would be blotted out.

Thus Jesus performed a continual service in the first apartment after His ascension to heaven. Just as in the earthly sanctuary the altar fires were to be kept burning continually, in readiness to consume the sacrifices of sinners who should

seek pardon, so Christ stood ready, day and night continually, to receive sinners and offer His shed blood in their behalf. His standing invitation to sinners is: "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He gives rest by taking away their load of sin, lifting the burden entirely from their shoulders. He beareth away the sins of the world.

Thus did Christ minister as High Priest in the holy place, receiving there the sins of the people who came unto God by Him. And thus the heavenly sanctuary has become defiled by the sins of men. From this defilement it requires cleansing at the close of His priestly ministry.

THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY

Daniel 8:14 introduces us to a work called the cleansing of the sanctuary: "He said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." In Hebrews 9:6, 7, Paul mentions the fact that in the sanctuary service on earth the priests served daily in the first apartment, but that the high priest went into the second apartment only once each year. During the daily ministration in the first apartment the sins of the children of Israel accumulated in the sanctuary. The arrangement was that when one committed sin in the camp of Israel, he should bring a lamb or other sin offering, place his hands upon its head, and confess his sins over it. Thus the sins of the individual were in type transferred to the sacrifice. Then the animal was killed, and a portion of its blood put upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering. The rest of the blood was poured out at the base of this altar, and the flesh was taken into the holy place of the sanctuary, where it was eaten by the priest. This service typified the transfer of the sin from the individual to the sanctuary, and thus the repentant sinner went away free. This slaying of the sacrifice prefigured the death of the Lamb of God, who was to be slain for the sins of the world. The bring-

ing of sin offerings to the sanctuary continued for the whole year, until the tenth day of the seventh month. On that day the sanctuary was to be cleansed.

The book of Leviticus, chapter 16, tells about the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary. Full details are given here as to what happened on that day. Two goats were brought before the priest, who was to cast lots upon them, thus choosing one to be the Lord's goat and the other for Azazel. (Azazel is the enemy, or adversary.) In other words, one goat was to represent the Lord, and the other God's adversary, Satan. When the lots were cast and the Lord's goat was selected, it was slain and the priest carried its blood into the sanctuary, beyond the second veil, into the most holy place. Verse 15 says that he was to sprinkle the blood on the mercy seat and before it, and this was to "make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation." Verse 16. Thus this special service was a cleansing service. It was to accomplish the cleansing of the holy place from the sins of the people.

This is further emphasized in verse 19, where we read: "He shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it." The cleansing, then, was accomplished by the sprinkling of the blood. But from what does he cleanse it? "He shall cleanse it, and hallow it from *the uncleanness of the children of Israel.*" Verse 19. So the cleansing of the sanctuary was a cleansing from *sin*. This is definitely established. It was not a cleansing from physical, but from spiritual defilement.

If, as is argued by some, the cleansing of the sanctuary consisted only in the removal of idols brought into it when Israel was in apostasy, that could have been done with men's hands. No blood would be necessary for such a work; but this cleansing of the sanctuary was accomplished with blood. "He shall sprinkle of the blood, . . . and cleanse it, and hal-

low it." Now the priest could not have removed idols out of the sanctuary by simply sprinkling blood upon them. The only uncleanness that can be cleansed by blood is that of sin. Therefore the cleansing of the sanctuary that is brought to view here is a spiritual cleansing from the sins of the people which had been received there.

The transfer, in figure, of the sins of the people went forward day after day during the entire year, until the Day of Atonement. Thus there was a constant accumulation of sins in the sanctuary, and by these sins it was defiled. For this reason the cleansing, or purging, of sin from the sanctuary became necessary. Thus the Lord said:

"He [the high priest] shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness." Lev. 16:16.

THE SCAPEGOAT

After the atonement was thus made for the sins of the people, the high priest passed out of the sanctuary, bearing the accumulated sins of the year out with him, and the live goat was brought. Placing his hands upon the head of the goat, the high priest confessed over it "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat." Lev. 16:21. Thus there was a removal of sin from the sanctuary, a cleansing from spiritual defilement. The sins that had accumulated there were now all disposed of as they were placed upon the head of the goat, which was sent away into the wilderness to die.

Why was this second goat necessary? Did not the blood of the first goat atone for the sins of the people? Yes, it must be so. Verse 20 indicates that when the scapegoat was brought, the priest had already made an end of reconciling the sanctuary. "When he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the

altar, he shall bring the live goat." What part, then, did Satan's goat have in the removal of sin? Just this: Satan is the instigator of all sin. He is primarily responsible for the sins of all men; and the death of Christ does not atone for his share of the responsibility and guilt. Therefore when our sins have been atoned for by the blood of Christ, Satan must yet answer for his part in those same sins. That is why they are eventually placed upon his head and he is made to suffer for them. He has no part in atoning for man's guilt, but he must suffer for his own guilt in leading men into sin.

A WORK OF JUDGMENT

This work of the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was a work of judgment. This is indicated in Leviticus 23:27-30:

"Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a Day of Atonement: it shall be a holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And ye shall do no work in that same day: for it is a Day of Atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God. For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in the same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people."

The Jewish people always recognized the Day of Atonement as a judgment day. Even to the present time it is so regarded. The following is a copy of a statement published in a Jewish paper in the city of San Francisco in 1892. The Jewish Day of Atonement was coming on, and the rabbi issued this announcement:

"The monitory sounds of the shophar [trumpet] are to be heard every morning in the orthodox synagogues, advising preparation for the day of memorial and of the final judgment of Yom Kippur [Yom—day, Kippur—atonement]."—*Jewish Exponent, September, 1892.*

In 1902 Isador Meyer, a Jewish rabbi, spoke of the Jew on the Day of Atonement as follows:

"He is also summoned by the voice of the same trumpet, or shophar, to scrutinize retrospectively his actions of the past year,

while he stands trembling before the all-seeing eye of Eternal Justice sitting on the throne of judgment."

From this we see that the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary on the Day of Atonement was a work of judgment. And the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was a type of the cleansing of the heavenly. Therefore it follows unquestionably that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is a work of judgment also.

THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY TO BE CLEANSED

Let us now return to Daniel's prophecy, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:14. The beginning and ending of the 2300 days is made very clear in the prophecy. In Daniel 9:24-27 this period is divided and subdivided in such a way as to leave us in no uncertainty whatever. Note the words of the prophecy:

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

"And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

Now we can be absolutely certain that we have the right dates for the beginning and ending of this period if we begin counting from the cross. From that as the starting point in our reckoning, we can count backward to find the beginning and forward to find the close. The first $69\frac{1}{2}$ weeks of this period were to reach down to the cross. At the end of $69\frac{1}{2}$

weeks, or $486\frac{1}{2}$ years (reckoning a prophetic day as a literal year), the sacrifice and oblation was to cease (verse 27), which signified that at that time the earthly sanctuary service would come to an end.

The event which terminated the earthly service was the crucifixion of Jesus, therefore we know that when Christ was crucified, $69\frac{1}{2}$ weeks, or $486\frac{1}{2}$ literal years, of the 2300 year period had passed. We have only to figure back $486\frac{1}{2}$ years to 457 B. C., to find the correct starting point; and forward $1813\frac{1}{2}$ years to 1844, to find the end of the period. It is clear, therefore, that the earthly sanctuary came to an end before the close of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, and that this prophecy could not refer to its cleansing. Since there were still $1813\frac{1}{2}$ years of the 2300 year period to be fulfilled after the cross, we must of necessity conclude that this prophecy of Daniel refers to the only sanctuary that was in existence at that time, that is, the heavenly.

Let us take it in another way. The period of seventy weeks, or 490 days, brought to view in the scripture already quoted, is only a division of the full period of 2300 days. The seventy weeks also had several divisions, each terminating with some definite event, such as the completion of the work of rebuilding Jerusalem, the baptism of the Saviour, the cutting off (or crucifixion) of the Messiah, and the completion of the time of the Jews. Taking the Bible method of reckoning prophetic time, i. e., each prophetic day for a literal year (Eze. 4:6), these seventy weeks, or 490 days, would equal 490 literal years, and they would date from 457 B. C., at which time the final and complete decree to restore Jerusalem went forth.

A THREEFOLD DECREE

We find this threefold decree given first by Cyrus, king of Persia (Ezra 1:2-4), repeated by Darius (Ezra 6:6-12), and again repeated by Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:12-26). In Ezra 6:14 we read these words:

"The elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia."

The commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem was, then, according to the Scripture itself, a threefold decree, given lastly by Artaxerxes in 457 B. C. From this date, therefore, we begin to count that long period of 2300 years reaching to 1844.

Seven weeks, or forty-nine years, of this time were to cover the period of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Forty-nine years this side of 457 B. C. would bring us to 408 B. C., the year in which the reconstruction work was completed.

Sixty-nine weeks, 483 years, were to reach to Messiah the Prince. This would bring us to 27 A. D., and that is the year when Jesus was baptized of John in the Jordan, upon which occasion He was anointed, receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit without measure (John 3:34), and was proclaimed the son of God by a voice from heaven. (See Luke 3:21, 22; Acts 10:38.)

THE SEVENTIETH WEEK

In the midst (middle) of the last, or seventieth, week, Messiah was to be cut off. A week would be seven prophetic days, or literal years, and half a week would be three and a half years. Christ was anointed for His earthly ministry in 27 A. D. Three and a half years later, or in 31 A. D., He was cut off by crucifixion.

The whole of the last, or seventieth, week was to be devoted especially to the Jews. "He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." Dan. 9:27. This was fulfilled by Christ's personal ministry of three and a half years, and by the ministry of His apostles, who for another three and a half years labored almost exclusively for the Jews. After that time the Jews were no longer to be considered the specially chosen people of God.

Beginning with Christ's ministry in 27 A. D., this week, or seven literal years, would reach to 34 A. D. It was in that year that Stephen was martyred, Paul was sent to the Gentiles, and the Jewish nation, as such, was rejected. In rejecting Christ and His gospel, they had rejected the only means of salvation, and God could no longer count them His chosen people. Soon after this it was boldly announced that the disciples had turned to the Gentiles.

"Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation unto the ends of the earth." Acts 13:46, 47.

This first division of the 2300-day prophecy—the seventy weeks—absolutely confirms the fact that we have the correct starting date for the entire period. Figured from the year 457 as a starting point, every detail of the prophecy works out to perfection; and therefore shows beyond all doubt that the initial date is correct.

This evidently was one of the reasons this subdivision of the prophecy was made. This seventy-week period was to "seal up" (make sure) the vision and prophecy. It serves to prove the starting point. When we therefore take 457 B. C. as the date for beginning this period of 2300 prophetic days, or literal years, it clearly brings us down to the year 1844 A. D. Or, to state it another way: The first seventy weeks, or 490 years, reached down to 34 A. D. The difference between 490 years and 2300 years is 1810, and if we add 1810 years to 34 A. D., we have 1844 A. D. The 2300-year prophecy ended, therefore, in 1844. The evidence of this is absolutely conclusive, as the subdivisions of the prophecy leave no room whatever for doubt.

But what was to happen at the end of the 2300 years? "He said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days;

then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:14. The time had come for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

CHRIST'S PRIESTLY MINISTRY

As we have already seen, the only sanctuary of God in existence in 1844 was the heavenly sanctuary. The earthly sanctuary, with its services, had passed away, having no further meaning after the cross; and the priesthood had changed from the sons of Aaron to Christ. At the time of Christ's ascension, He began His priestly ministry in the sanctuary above as our High Priest. But this ministry was performed in the "holy place," or first room of the tabernacle. The second apartment, within the dividing veil, known as the "holy of holies," was not to be entered except on the Day of Atonement, when the sanctuary was to be cleansed from sin.

The time for this event to take place in heaven arrived in 1844. In Daniel 8:17, where the angel explains to Daniel the prophecy of the 2300 years, he declares, "At the time of the end shall be the vision." This expression is used in numerous places in the Bible to designate a little period of time just before the return of our Lord, and during which the final preparations for that event are being made both in heaven and upon earth. The heavenly sanctuary, therefore, was to be cleansed in "the time of the end," and the actual work was to begin in the year 1844 A. D.

This is in harmony with the type, for in the earthly sanctuary the priest, as we have already seen, spent the greater part of the year in the first apartment; and only a short time at the close of the yearly round in the most holy place, where he would be engaged in the work of cleansing the sanctuary. So in heaven Jesus went first into the first apartment, and served there as priest until 1844. That corresponded to the long period spent by the priest in the first apartment on earth. He entered the second apartment in 1844, in the last end of His priestly ministry, to do a short work, and to make an end of sin. That work is called the cleansing of the sanctuary.

But it may be asked: Is there anything in heaven that needs to be cleansed? Yes, there is sin. As we have already observed, the cleansing of the sanctuary is not a cleansing from physical defilement, but is a spiritual cleansing, and has to do with the removal of the record and defilement of sin. In 1 Timothy 5:24 we are told: "Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after." Those who have through the years accepted Jesus as their sacrifice have been sending their sins into the sanctuary for judgment.

The only way that sin can get into the sanctuary is by confession and the offering of a substitutionary sacrifice. Therefore only the sins of those who have accepted Christ as their Redeemer are found there. The sins of the wicked have never been brought into the sanctuary, and so unrepentant sinners will have to be judged at a later time. Judgment begins at the house of God; the righteous will be judged first. Thus all confessed sins are transferred to the sanctuary, and in this manner the sanctuary is defiled.

In the earthly sanctuary service, man confessed his sins over the lamb, which was slain on his behalf, and thus the sins were, in type, transferred to the sanctuary.

Just so, I am a sinner; Jesus is my sacrificial Lamb and also my High Priest. He has died for me, but His death is of no avail to me until I accept Him as my substitute. When I do accept Him, I then confess my sins to God through Him, just as the man in Israel confessed his sins over his offering. And thus my sins are transferred from myself to the sanctuary above, where Christ ministers as priest on my behalf. He takes away my sins, and gives me His righteousness. But where does He take them? He takes them to the sanctuary, where He is ministering as priest; and although they are forgiven, the record of them must there remain until they are blotted out in the judgment.

Some one may say: I thought that when Christ forgave my sins, He took them clear away. Yes, He did, so far as

you are concerned. He promises to make us as white as snow. But this does not mean that the sins are finally disposed of. He takes them from us, but the record is still there. We are free because we have accepted Him as our substitute and sin bearer, but the record of sin is held in the sanctuary.

Some one else may say: But was not the death of Christ on the cross a complete atonement for sin? We answer the question by asking another: In the earthly sanctuary, when the goat was brought and killed in the outer court by the altar, was the atonement completed by that act? No, the blood had to be taken into the sanctuary and brought into contact with the broken law and the sins of the people. There was a priestly work to be performed after the shedding of the blood.

So when Christ died on the cross, He had fulfilled the type of the Lord's goat being slain, but the atonement could not be complete until the blood He had shed on the cross was offered before God and His broken law in the sanctuary. Therefore the death of Christ on the cross was not the completion of the atonement. It was a part of the work of atonement, but the priestly work was all to follow. The offering of the blood before the law and before the throne had not yet taken place. If the atonement was completed at the cross, then why did Jesus become a priest? What priestly work was there to do? There would be none. The fact that Christ became a priest shows that there was a priestly service to be performed in the heavenly sanctuary in order to make the work of atonement effective and complete.

It may be asked, Is it not possible that after Christ made the sacrifice He went back to heaven, and immediately performed His priestly work, including the cleansing of the sanctuary, and closed it all up in just a little while? Possibly He might have thus dispensed with the sins of those who lived before the cross, but you and I, dear reader, were not yet born. If Christ finished His priestly work immediately upon His ascension, then we are eternally lost, having no High Priest,

no Advocate, no priestly service for sins. Christ could not go into heaven and offer His blood to the Father on my behalf, as my substitute, until I had decided that I wanted Him to act for me. His ministry in heaven does not avail for me until I accept Him as my sacrifice and priest. He died for me 1900 years ago, but His death is not counted for me until I accept Him.

Therefore the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary could not be completed until the work of redemption is completed. The offering of the blood of Christ in heaven is a continual offering. He died only once, but every time a sinner comes to God through Him, He pleads His shed blood on his behalf, and in that moment the sacrifice of Christ becomes efficacious in that man's case.

Another may ask, Why could not Christ have immediately blotted out the sins of the people? Why wait until after 1844? We reply: There must come first an investigation of the records. That is essential. Here is a man who has accepted Christ. His sins have gone on before him into the sanctuary, but Christ cannot blot those sins out of the record until that man's life is finished, or until probation closes for him. Why not? Because he may not continue in faith, and we are told in Ezekiel 33:12, 13, that if the righteous man turns away from his righteousness, all the righteousness that he has done shall not be remembered. If he does not continue in faith, all his past sins will come back upon him again. Jesus does not plead before the throne of God in the final judgment for one who has died in sin. He cannot plead His blood in behalf of one who, though once a Christian, refuses to continue in His grace. Thus before the Lord can blot out the sins from the record books, a very careful examination has to be made to see whether those who accepted Christ have remained true. "Be thou faithful unto death," says the Scripture, "and thou shalt have a crown of life." Rev. 2:10. It is not the beginning of the race that gives assurance of the crown of life; it is the successful finishing.

THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary necessarily is a work of judgment, just as was the cleansing of the earthly. When this work is completed, probation will close and Christ's priestly ministry on behalf of sinners will cease.

There are two phases to any work of judgment. One is the trying of the case, the searching of the records, the hearing of the witnesses, and the pronouncing of the sentence. The other is the work of executing that sentence after the case has been fully tried and the decision rendered. The first is the investigative judgment; the other, the executive judgment.

When God's judgment begins, it begins with those who have at some time in life accepted the plan of salvation, and have been numbered with the household of God. Their names have been written in the Lamb's book of life, and the judgment determines whether their names should be eternally retained there, or whether they should be blotted out from the book of life. Thus Peter declares: "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" 1 Peter 4:17.

This phase of the judgment work—the investigation of the records of the righteous—is carried on while people still live upon the earth, and while the call to repentance is still being sounded throughout the nations. Thus we read:

"I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:6, 7.

Here is a solemn announcement that is to be carried to all nations and kindreds and tongues, and the burden of the message is, "The hour of His judgment *is* come." It is a warning direct from heaven that the judgment has begun, and that men should hasten to worship God and give glory to Him.

Since it would begin first with those who lived in Adam's time, and who are now dead, there would yet be time for those still living upon the earth to make their peace with God, and hence the final appeal from heaven for men to prepare for that great and solemn hour when their own names would be called in review before God. This message, announcing that "the hour of God's judgment is come," was due to go to the nations in 1844 A. D., for that is the time pointed out by the prophecy as the starting point of the judgment, and it was in the year 1844 that the pioneers of the people who are now called "Seventh-day Adventists" discovered this mighty truth and began to herald it to the world. They believe, therefore, that they are literally fulfilling this prophecy of Revelation 14:6, 7, and that they have as solemn a commission from God as did Jonah when he was sent to warn Nineveh of its impending destruction.

The opening of the judgment in the heavenly sanctuary in 1844 is graphically described by the prophet Daniel. Said he: "I beheld till thrones were placed, and One that was ancient of days did sit: His raiment was white as snow, and the hair of His head like pure wool; His throne was fiery flames, and the wheels thereof burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousands of thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Dan. 7:9, 10, A. R. V.

Thus we see that the judging is done from books of record, in which is recorded "every secret thing," even to "every idle word that men shall speak."

So, then, there is a time of judgment. It corresponds to the Day of Atonement in the earthly sanctuary service. And in that day of judgment the record books in heaven are opened and searched. After this investigation, sins are blotted out as Jesus pleads His spilled blood in behalf of sinners who trusted in Him for salvation, and who remained faithful to the end.

In the cases of those who have proved unfaithful, the record of the sin remains against them.

During the judgment the names of those who were once Christians but who have given up their faith in Christ, are blotted out of the book of life. But the promise abides: "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before My Father, and before His angels." Rev. 3:5.

It is clearly stated in the Scripture that this blotting out of sins is to take place just before the return of Jesus. Thus Peter declares:

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began." Acts 3:19-21.

It is to be at the time of refreshing, which is the outpouring of the latter rain upon the remnant church. (See Acts 2:17; Joel 2:28-32.) It will be just before Jesus comes. It will be just before the "restitution of all things." Therefore it will be in the very last days of the world's history, and this blotting out of sins is the result of the investigative judgment, and constitutes a work of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary, where the record of all the sins of God's people has been kept.

The mere fact that one at some time in life has become a Christian and has united with the church, is no guaranty of his final salvation. Said Jesus: "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matt. 24:13. And again we read: "Be thou faithful until death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. 2:10.

The doctrine of "once in grace, always in grace," will not do. There are thousands who start well, but who "cast away" their "confidence" (Heb. 10:35), and who in the final judg-

ment will be weighed and found wanting. This is clearly set forth in Ezekiel's prophecy, as follows:

"When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." "Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord God. Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Eze. 18:24, 30.

The idea of a final judgment of the righteous is also conveyed by other passages of Scripture. In the parable of the wicked servant, narrated in Matthew 18:23-35, the thought is conveyed that even though one is forgiven and accepted of God, if he goes out from the merciful presence of his Lord, and treats his fellow servant unmercifully and cruelly, he will at last find himself condemned without mercy.

In the parable a servant who had just been forgiven a great debt by his lord, beat his fellow servant who owed him a small sum, and even cast him into prison. When his lord learned of this, he judged him worthy of the severest punishment, even though he had previously been forgiven all his debt; and "so likewise," said Jesus, "shall My heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

When the work of the investigative judgment is completed, and Christ is about to return, to reward every man according as his work shall be, then the divine fiat will go forth from the throne, fixing the destiny of every soul: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. 22:11.

At that solemn moment, human probation will be closed forever. The righteous will be sealed for eternal life, and the "unjust" and "filthy" must remain so until they receive their just reward of eternal death.

THE LAW OF THE JUDGMENT

Every judiciary must have a code by which the cases brought before the court are tried. Without this, trial would be a farce, and the decisions rendered, a travesty on justice. God must of necessity, therefore, have a law by which He will test men's lives, a standard by which they will be measured; and if so, surely in this solemn hour, when court week has actually begun and cases are already being tried, it behooves every man to inquire seriously what that standard or code is, and to take the necessary steps to bring his life into harmony with it before his name is called.

We inquire, therefore, What is the standard of God's judgment? What is the code that will be used by the Ancient of days? And the reply comes from the Sacred Book, clear as a voice from heaven:

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12:13, 14.

And again:

"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:10-12.

And the third time the answer is given:

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14.

Could God have made it plainer or more easily understood? The standard of the judgment will be God's ten commandments that were spoken by His mighty voice from Sinai, of which, according to Christ's sermon on the mount, not one jot or tittle has passed away. (See Matt. 5:18.) This law has ten distinct and definite points. There are ten of the

commandments. James declares that a man may "keep the whole law" except just one point, and still be pronounced guilty in the judgment. Do not allow yourself to be deceived, therefore, into believing that nine points of the law will suffice, and the Sabbath point can be dropped out as nonessential.

Mr. Canright's "nine commandment law" which he tries to discover in the New Testament, which has no Sabbath, will not do. It is one point short. And that one point is just what James warns us about. We may keep the nine points faithfully, but that will not suffice. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10. When our names are called before the tribunal of heaven, it will be a full, complete moral code, without the change of a jot or a tittle, by which we will be measured. If we are short on one point, the sentence can be only, "Weighed in the balance, and found wanting."

"We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10. "He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath One that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12:48.

CHAPTER XV

WHO ARE THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS?

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS date the origin of their movement from the years 1844-50. Many of the original founders of the Seventh-day Adventist faith were former associates of William Miller (a lay Baptist preacher) and many others who, previous to 1844, with great earnestness proclaimed the approaching second advent of the Lord to the earth. These people, who represented many Protestant denominations, were known as Adventists because of their faith in the imminence of the personal return of Jesus, and their message resounded throughout the world and claimed converts from many nations. This message produced a great religious awakening such as had not been witnessed since the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Expectation of the coming of Christ about the year 1844 was built upon a study of certain Bible prophecies containing the time element. In the exposition of such prophecies the generally accepted rule of interpretation was, and still is, a day for a year, according to Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6.

The particular prophecy which led Mr. Miller and his associates to set a date for the second advent was Daniel 8:14, which declares, in part: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

As pointed out in the previous chapter, Daniel 9:24, 25 furnished an event from which to count these day-years, in the words: "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." This command, or decree, went forth in 457 B. C. (See Ezra 6:14.)

Knowing that the earth, once destroyed and purged by water, is, according to 2 Peter 3:6, 7, to be again destroyed and purged, this time by fire, and mistakenly supposing the earth to be the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14, it was only natural for the advent believers of that day to conclude that the end would come at the expiration of the 2300 days, which time period ended in the autumn of 1844, on the twenty-second day of October.

Profoundly convinced that the world was about to witness the glory of its descending Lord, and that all men, rich and poor, were to be summoned before the great white throne, there to face the Judge and to hear His sentence pronounced upon them, Miller and his associates raised throughout all Christendom the solemn cry, "Prepare to meet thy God." Their message rang like a trumpet call throughout the world. This produced a great religious awakening, and people everywhere turned to God and repented of their sins.

This movement extended from 1833 to 1844. In America the message was proclaimed by some three hundred ministers belonging to many different denominations. In Great Britain some seven hundred Church of England clergymen took up the cry.

Books and charts on the second advent were distributed intensively in Norway, and literature on the second advent was sent to most of the mission stations in heathen lands.

Dr. Joseph Wolff, a noted itinerant missionary, "down to the year 1845, proclaimed the Lord's speedy advent in Palestine, Egypt, on the shores of the Red Sea, Mesopotamia, the Crimea, Persia, Georgia, throughout the Ottoman Empire, in Greece, Arabia, Turkey, Bokhara, Afghanistan, Cashmere, Hindostan, Tibet, in Holland, Scotland, Ireland, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, St. Helena, also on shipboard in the Mediterranean, and in New York City to all denominations. He declares that he has preached among Jews, Turks, Mohammedans, Parsees, Hindus, Chaldeans, Yesedes, Syrians,

Sabæans, to pashas, sheiks, shahs, the kings of Organtsh and Bokhara, the queen of Greece, etc.”—*“Voice of the Church,”* p. 343; cited in *“The Great Second Advent Movement,”* by J. N. Loughborough, p. 101.

Everywhere the burden of the message given was, “Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come.” Rev. 14:7. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, adherents of the Church of England, and people of many other persuasions joined the movement, and helped to swell the cry. Most of these people, however, retained their membership in the churches to which they had always belonged. Mr. Miller’s preaching of this doctrine apparently did not disqualify him for membership in the Baptist Church, for his biographer states:

“In 1833 Miller received a license to preach from the Baptist Church, of which he was a member. A large number of ministers of his denomination also approved his work, and it was with their formal sanction that he continued his labors.”

He continued in the Baptist Church until his death.

Mr. Miller had the date figured out correctly. No one from that time to this has ever been able to refute the accuracy of his reckoning. But he was clearly mistaken regarding the event that was to take place. The Miller Adventists thought that the sanctuary spoken of in the prophecy, and which was to be cleansed, was this sin-defiled earth. They saw from other scriptures that when the earth is finally purified, its purification will be accomplished by fire, and that this cleansing work will be connected with the appearing of our Lord. They concluded, therefore, that if the time for cleansing the sanctuary was to begin in 1844, it must be that the Lord would return at that time and save His people out of the world before the cleansing by fire began.

Their failure, therefore, lay in a wrong view of what the sanctuary was. They did not, at that time, understand the types and antitypes of the Old Testament, as men have come

to understand them since. They did not grasp the thought of a heavenly sanctuary, "of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man" (Heb. 8:2), and of which Jesus, our High Priest, is minister. They did not see that in heaven there was to be a work of judgment, the antitype of the Day of Atonement solemnized in ancient Israel once each year (Leviticus 16), and that this judgment, mentioned in Daniel 7:9, 10, must be completed before the Lord's return to earth; for at that time the destiny of all will have been decided, and Jesus will bring His rewards with Him, "to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12.

When the twenty-second day of October of that year passed without bringing the end of all things earthly, those who had confidently looked for the return of their Lord were thrown into great perplexity. Some entirely gave up their faith in the second advent. Others sought to establish some other date for the realization of their hopes.

Others, and among them was Mr. Miller himself, thought that for some unaccountable reason the advent was simply delayed, and might occur any day. To Joshua V. Himes, a devout clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a faithful yokefellow in heralding the advent near, Mr. Miller wrote:

"We have done our work in warning sinners, and in trying to awake a formal church. God in His providence has shut the door; we can only stir one another up to be patient, and be diligent to make our calling and election sure."—*Advent Herald*, Dec. 11, 1844.

DISCOVERING MILLER'S MISTAKE

But some of these earnest Christians who had been disappointed, instead of seeking readjustment of time, or simply waiting, began a diligent study of the Scriptures, and shortly found that the earth is not the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14, and that the prophecy foretold, not the cleansing of the earth by

fire in the year 1844, but the beginning of the closing work of our great High Priest, Jesus Christ, in the true sanctuary in heaven, and that Christ could not come until the completion of that work.

They came to see clearly that the sanctuary whose cleansing was to begin in 1844, at the close of the 2300 years of Daniel 8:14, was the sanctuary of God in heaven, and not the earth, and that its cleansing involved the work of the investigative judgment, which was to take place immediately preceding our Lord's return, of which we have spoken more specifically in a previous chapter.

It was in this same year (1844) that a number of Adventist believers began the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, and thus became in fact Seventh-day Adventists, although this name was not formally adopted until 1860.

We do not suggest, however, that the doctrines held by the Seventh-day Adventists are new. Quite to the contrary; they have been held through past ages by both patriarchs and prophets, whose faith in them has been fittingly recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of the second advent of Christ, and was among those who recognized the binding claims of the law of God and the seventh-day Sabbath. Abraham was another, Moses was another, and the prophets and apostles were others. Even Jesus our Lord, during His earthly life, both taught and practiced these doctrines. But these truths had been largely lost sight of in the apostasy of the early centuries and the Dark Ages, and it became necessary to raise up a people to set them again in their proper light before the world that was about to meet an offended Lord over His broken law.

The acceptance of the Scriptural doctrine that the sanctuary is in heaven, opened an entirely new field to the vision of these advent believers. They saw that there was an essential and solemn work to be wrought by our great High Priest in the

most holy apartment of the heavenly temple before He could come to earth, and that during the same time a work of great magnitude and importance must be accomplished by the church upon the earth. They read in an entirely new light the striking prophecy of Revelation 11:19: "The temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament."

They remembered that the ark was kept only in the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary, and that that apartment was opened only when the high priest went in on the tenth day of the seventh month to make final atonement before the ark to cleanse the sanctuary and the people. Here they saw the same work revealed in heaven. Here, then, was the cleansing of the sanctuary which was to begin at the end of the 2300 days in 1844.

They now received a new view of the law of God, since its position in the antitypical sanctuary or temple in heaven was found to be exactly the same as was its position in the typical sanctuary upon earth, thus utterly and forever precluding the idea of any change in that law through all the intervening ages. It must read in the ark in heaven just exactly as it read in the ark upon earth. Vividly there came now to their minds the words of Jesus when He said, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law" (Matt. 5:18); and remembering that the law emphatically declares that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work" (see Ex. 20:8-11), they recognized that Christians are under obligation to keep this original Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

For some time the burden of those who had become Seventh-day Adventists by embracing the Bible Sabbath was for "the scattered flock," or in other words, for those who had accepted the message of the second advent as preached by William Miller and some three hundred other ministers in this country, of nearly all the orthodox denominations.

They later, however, came to see that before Christ's coming a great reform message must go to the world, warning men of the approaching day of God, and urging them to make full preparation for it by repentance of sin and belief of the gospel. They further saw that this reform message would be similar to the work of Elijah, and would call men everywhere to the keeping of the commandments of God as revealed in the decalogue, or ten commandments, including the fourth commandment, which clearly enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week (Saturday) as the holy Sabbath; that while righteousness comes only through faith in the atonement made by our Lord Jesus Christ, yet that faith does not make void the law of Jehovah, nor free Christians from obligation to keep it.

Being profoundly convinced that these things were true, the few Seventh-day Adventist believers, after several years' study and adjustment, began to plan for the dissemination of what to them was a message of great importance and urgency. They concluded that the message of the soon coming of Christ and the warning to prepare for that momentous event must be world wide in its application, and since no other branch of the Christian church seemed to feel any particular burden to give it, they decided that it was incumbent upon them to carry it to the entire world, and this is what they then set out to do. Their convictions in this matter were based upon such texts of Scripture as the following:

"Behold, I will send My Messenger, and He shall prepare the way before Me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 3:1.

"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14.

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My Holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:11.

"Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your

God, and cry unto the Lord, Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come." Joel 1:14, 15.

"I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:6, 7.

As already indicated, Seventh-day Adventists believe these scriptures clearly teach that just before Jesus comes, He will raise up messengers to prepare the way before Him, as John the Baptist was raised up to prepare the way for the first advent of Jesus. This preparatory message must be world wide in extent, going "to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." It is a warning message, and is reformatory in its nature; and as John the revelator wrote of it, he clearly indicated that it would result in gathering out of the nations a people of whom it is said, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

TIME SETTERS?

One of the charges urged by Mr. Canright against the Seventh-day Adventists is that they are "time setters." He says of them:

"They set the time for the end of the world in 1843, and failed. They set it again in 1844, and failed."—"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," by D. M. Canright, p. 79.

Now we submit that this constitutes a gross misrepresentation. We have no disposition whatsoever to cover up the fact that some who later became Seventh-day Adventists were in the Miller movement and believed and preached that the end of the world would come in 1844, yet as Mr. Canright well knew, the *Seventh-day Adventist movement*, which arose subsequently to the 1844 disappointment, has held as one of its basic beliefs from the very outset an interpretation of prophecy that shut out the possibility of setting a time for our Lord's

return and the end of the world. We refer to the interpretation given by Seventh-day Adventists to the prophecy of the 2300 days of the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel.

Seventh-day Adventism as a distinctive movement was not launched until after the disappointment of Miller and his followers in 1844, and therefore this church cannot rightly be charged with the 1844 mistake.

We would remind the reader that Mr. Canright renounced "Seventh-day Adventism," and not merely "adventism" in general, which includes many sects and beliefs. Certain Adventist bodies have set times for the Lord to return, but the *Seventh-day Adventists as a body* have never done so.

Mr. Canright knew that he was writing his book against a denomination which had its rise subsequent to the disappointment of 1844, and yet he boldly declares that "they set the time for the end of the world in 1843, and failed. They set it again in 1844, and failed."

He challenges Seventh-day Adventists on their denominational view of the heavenly sanctuary which absolutely precludes time setting, and yet says that they are the time setters and believed that the earth was the sanctuary.

The very first statement in Mr. Canright's book is half truth and half error, and is therefore calculated to deceive. This appears on page 25, chapter 1, paragraph 1, and in it he says:

"Seventh-day Adventism originated about fifty years ago in the work of Mr. Miller, who set the time for the end of the world in 1843-44."

This opening statement is intended, of course, to brand Seventh-day Adventists as fanatical "time setters," and thus immediately to create prejudice against them and their teachings.

Again on page 76 of his book we read:

"Miller is responsible for all the time setting done by the Adventists since his time, because they are the legitimate outgrowth

of his work. He began setting time. He did it the second time. He taught them how to do it. He fathered the idea. He inculcated it in all his followers. They then simply took up and carried on what he had begun."

This is a gross misrepresentation of the work and teachings of Seventh-day Adventists, as any one who had preached for them for twenty-eight years, as had Mr. Canright, would well know. These statements would indicate that William Miller, who set the time for the return of our Lord in 1844, was the founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church; that Miller and the Seventh-day Adventists believed and taught the same thing; in fact, that it was all one movement, Millerism and Seventh-day Adventism being one and the same thing. No other impression could be received from these words of Mr. Canright, "*They . . . took up and carried on what he had begun,*" in the matter of time setting.

Now let the reader note how quickly Mr. Canright's fertile mind could change from one side of an argument to another when it served his purpose to do so. A little farther on in his book, where he tries to show how very unpopular Seventh-day Adventists were when their work first started, he speaks of *the opposition they had from William Miller*, this very man who, in his first chapter, he sets forth as the founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

"He [Miller] especially points out the Seventh-day Adventist positions as utterly wrong. He knew all about their arguments on the three messages, the sanctuary, the Sabbath, etc., and yet he not only rejected them, but earnestly warned his people against them. . . . Not a leading man in Miller's work ever embraced the views of the Seventh-day Adventists."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,*" p. 78.

Now, it would be utterly impossible to harmonize these two statements of Mr. Canright's regarding Miller and his relation to the Seventh-day Adventist movement. In the one Miller is made responsible for what Seventh-day Adventists have done, and in the second he as plainly declares that Miller rejected the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists and warned his

people against them, and that not a leading man in Miller's work ever embraced the views of the Seventh-day Adventists. Could two statements possibly be more conflicting?

The Miller movement, as such, ended with the passing of the time, October 22, 1844, before the Seventh-day Adventist Church was founded. It is true, also, as stated by Mr. Canright, that Mr. Miller, who was still living at the time the work of Seventh-day Adventists began, refused to accept their teachings, and continued on as *a member of the Baptist Church* till his death.

Except the doctrine of the imminence of the personal and literal advent of our Lord, there was practically nothing held in common by the Adventists of Miller's movement and the Seventh-day Adventists, who, as such, came upon the stage of action after the disappointment. The Seventh-day Adventists believe that the dates worked out by Miller for the cleansing of the sanctuary in 1844 were correct, but they recognize that he was mistaken as to the event which was to take place on that date. Mr. Miller believed that the sanctuary was the earth; Seventh-day Adventists believe it is the place where Christ ministers as High Priest in heaven.

In common with most other Baptists, Mr. Miller observed Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath; the Seventh-day Adventists hold that the seventh day should be kept according to the fourth command of the decalogue.

We understand that Mr. Miller believed in the natural immortality of the soul, and that people go to their reward at death; Seventh-day Adventists believe that man is mortal, that the dead are asleep, unconscious, and that they will not receive their rewards until after the judgment and the resurrection of the dead.

As already pointed out, a number of those who were associated with Mr. Miller in his work were among those who later became Seventh-day Adventists. But that fact does not make the Seventh-day Adventist Church responsible for Mr. Miller's unscriptural views.

If, therefore, Mr. Miller and his followers were not Seventh-day Adventists, but were Baptists, Methodists, etc., who believed in the second advent, how can it be truthfully said that Seventh-day Adventists are time setters simply because Mr. Miller set the time for the Lord to come? Why not say that the Baptists are time setters, seeing that Mr. Miller was a Baptist and not a Seventh-day Adventist? Why should Mr. Canright, a Baptist preacher, try to confuse the issue by shifting the responsibility of time setting from members of his church to the Seventh-day Adventist Church? There could be only one reason,—to create prejudice against that church.

Seventh-day Adventists do believe that our Lord will return in person to this earth, in harmony with His definite promise recorded in John 14:1-3 and Acts 1:9-11. They also believe that the prophetic portions of the Scriptures clearly point to the fact that His coming is near, "even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. They are attempting, by the grace of God, to prepare their hearts and lives for that great day, and believe they should embrace every opportunity to encourage others to do likewise; but *never* has the Seventh-day Adventist denomination fixed a date for our Lord's return.

Mr. Canright says on page 75 of his work that Elder James White, who became a strong leader in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, was associated with Mr. Miller, and engaged in preaching a definite time for the Lord to come. Of course this is true. Elder James White was in the Miller movement, and ardently believed in Miller's teachings. But it should be understood that Elder White was then a member of the Christian Church. He had not yet become a Seventh-day Adventist.

That some lone individual or minister who became a Seventh-day Adventist should have clung for a little period to the idea of time setting would be expected in the very nature of the case. And the citing of some such individual is no valid indictment of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

But there is no need that we make further answer to this

time-setting charge, for Mr. Canright himself, in his book, "The Lord's Day," which he wrote subsequently to his "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," makes this sweeping admission:

"To their credit it should be said that Seventh-day Adventists do not believe in setting time definitely since 1844."—"*The Lord's Day*," p. 38.

Now, since there were no Seventh-day Adventists before the end of 1844, and since, as Mr. Canright admits, they "do not believe in setting time definitely since 1844," we submit that they are not time setters at all.

BEGAN A WORLD ENDEAVOR

It seemed presumptuous for so small a group of people as the Seventh-day Adventists were in the early years of their movement, to undertake a world endeavor. There were only a few of them at first, and for sixteen years they had no church organization, no buildings, no institutions, practically no literature, and but little money. But they had a growing conviction that they had discovered in the Holy Scriptures light and truth which must be given to the world, and with undaunted courage born of faith in God, they began the work.

The first tracts by Sabbath-keeping Adventists were published in 1846; and in 1849 a periodical entitled *The Present Truth* was started. The first general meeting to be held by them was called at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, in 1848. This was before they fully realized what was involved in giving a world-wide message. The name "Seventh-day Adventists" was adopted in 1860, but it was not until 1861 that their first churches were formally organized. The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was organized two years later, with delegates present from six State conferences, which had been previously organized.

In 1874 missionaries began to go out to other countries, and the work soon became established in every continent of the

world, from which it quickly spread to adjacent island fields, and in all those lands converts began to appear and churches were established. Paralleling this spread of missionary endeavor was a steady growth of institutional work. Publishing houses were established, scores of periodicals and hundreds of books and tracts began to be printed; schools and colleges were built for the purpose of educating and training gospel workers who could go everywhere with the message; and sanitariums and hospitals were founded for the relief of the sick and suffering, these being operated entirely by Christian physicians and nurses. In seeking to bring their patients under the influence of the gospel, they furnished balm to both body and soul.

Taking a retrospective view of this movement during the eighty-nine years since it had its first feeble beginnings, we find that its development has been very remarkable, to say the least. In some countries, Seventh-day Adventist membership has been doubling every four or five years, and today there is scarcely a land on earth where their work is not established or into which their missions are not being projected.

From the very character of their message, it is only natural that their appeal is to all men alike. They preach to Jew, Christian, Mohammedan, Buddhist, heathen—anybody anywhere who will pause to hear. Thousands of their converts have been made direct from heathenism, and we believe that their mission stations may be found today in more of the heathen tribes of the world than those of any other Protestant church.

They had, at the close of 1931, a total of 10,850 evangelical laborers, 71 union conferences, 154 state or provincial conferences, and 278 organized mission fields, and were conducting active work in 455 languages.

They were then operating 68 publishing houses and branches, and distributing literature throughout the world to the value of nearly \$5,000,000 annually. They were then print-

ing and circulating 237 separate periodicals, 1,567 bound books, 905 pamphlets, and 3,678 tracts. The total cost of a single copy of each of these publications would be \$1,885.80. The total sales of literature during sixty-eight years had in 1931 amounted to \$92,475,729.83.

They were conducting 1,937 primary schools, and their institutions for intermediate and higher education numbered 196. Of these higher schools, one is a Grade A medical college, six are senior colleges, and the rest are junior colleges or academies. Their total student enrollment in primary, intermediate, and college grades, was 90,465.

One hundred twelve medical institutions were in operation, employing 586 Christian physicians and 3,532 nurses and other helpers.

The total denominational investment in the various institutions was \$54,114,844.52.

Not a dollar of earnings from any institution operated by them accrues to any individual, but any gains made from year to year are either used to extend the work of the respective institutions or are appropriated to the mission treasury to be used in the extension of the work in other lands.

The ministers of the church are supported by tithe paid voluntarily by the church membership, and the mission work in foreign lands is supported by additional freewill offerings. These offerings to missions now total about two million dollars annually.

The membership, comparatively speaking, is not large. In the very nature of the case this is to be expected. The acceptance of the Seventh-day Adventist faith entails a great sacrifice in every land, particularly in civilized countries. The keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath and the nonuse of tobacco and all alcoholic liquors are points that bring a real test to all would-be adherents. But that which has astonished multitudes in the religious world is the fact that only a few hundred thousand people should be able, under God, to maintain such

an extensive work, embracing every great country of the entire globe, besides many smaller ones.

When Mr. Canright separated from the Seventh-day Adventist communion and published his "dumfounder" in 1889, he predicted an early failure of the entire movement. Speaking of the efforts of the Seventh-day Adventists to extend and support their work, he said:

"It is doubtful how long they can maintain this strain without a crash."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 27.

On page 26 of his work he gives statistics to show the extent to which the work of the Seventh-day Adventists had grown at that time. Here he says:

"In 1888 they had 400 ordained ministers and licentiates, 901 churches, 21,112 members, 31 conferences, and five missions."

He further states that they sold that year \$90,000 worth of books, were issuing twenty-six periodicals in different languages, had seven publishing houses, three sanitariums, two colleges, one academy, and several smaller schools, with sixty-two teachers and 1,000 students. He pictures these institutions as being hopelessly in debt, and says the efforts made to meet these debts had drained the pockets of many of their people and discouraged others. It was then that he predicted the "crash."

But that was many years ago, and the crash has not come. During this time their work has increased in every land; the number of evangelical workers has multiplied twenty-five times; their conference and mission field organizations, about thirteen times; their principal institutions have increased from thirteen to 417; their annual student enrollment has grown from 1,000 to 90,465, and membership gains have been made every year.

The total funds contributed annually for religious work have increased from something like \$200,000 in 1888 to \$11,034,162.22 in 1931. At the time Mr. Canright wrote, "It is doubtful how long they can maintain this strain without

a crash," the per capita giving was about \$8 per annum. This had increased to \$32.84 per member in 1931, and, strange to say, the crash seems as far off today as it did when Mr. Canright wrote his book. In fact, if the writer is any judge of humanity, it would be hard to find a happier and more contented people on the earth than are these Seventh-day Adventists, who are thus contributing more liberally per capita than any other people in the whole world to the support of gospel work.

The writer attended a quadrennial session of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference held in the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco, California, in 1930. There were some 10,000 representatives of this church in attendance, including nationals of many lands. There were Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, native Africans, chiefs from the islands of the South Seas, Egyptians, Indians of the Andes, Mexicans, Hawaiians, Peruvians, Haitians, and representatives from the Dutch East Indies, besides the thousands who came from Canada and the United States, and the several European countries; and if, among all this throng, there was one who was discouraged about this Seventh-day Adventist movement, or who felt that it was about to crash under the strain, we saw no sign of such feeling. Joy and contentment were expressed in the faces of all those present, and this, we believe, is attributable to the fact that in all their hearts had been planted the "blessed hope" of soon witnessing the "glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13), and of realizing in this great event all that their hearts have yearned for.

CHAPTER XVI

THE WORK OF MRS. E. G. WHITE

ONE of Mr. Canright's most bitter attacks is launched against the life and work of Mrs. E. G. White, who, until the time of her death, was a respected, beloved worker in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. He devotes an entire chapter to her, and frequently attacks her in other chapters. Besides, there was published under his name, just about the time of his death, a volume of 201 pages devoted entirely to an effort to discredit her work.

We do not hesitate to say that Seventh-day Adventists recognize in Mrs. E. G. White's work a special manifestation of the gift of the Spirit spoken of in the Bible as the "Spirit of prophecy." (See Rev. 19:10.) Nor is this a strange or new doctrine, since among the spiritual gifts promised to the church, and ranking with apostles, evangelists, teachers, etc., is the gift of prophecy, and its work has been recognized by the church in all ages.

Thus Paul speaks of these gifts as follows: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." 1 Cor. 12:27, 28.

In speaking of the last stage of the church of Christ, John the revelator describes it and the experience of its members thus: "The dragon was wroth with the woman [the church], and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and *have the testimony of Jesus Christ.*" Rev. 12:17.

The church of God, here spoken of as a remnant, and against whom the dragon (Satan) will be especially angry in

the last days, was foreseen as a commandment-keeping company who would have the "testimony of Jesus Christ." If we inquire as to what is meant by the "testimony of Jesus," we find an answer to our query in Revelation 19:10, where the angel (Gabriel) clearly explained to John that "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." These two characteristics will therefore distinguish the true remnant church of God in the latter end of the history of the world. Its members will be commandment keepers, and the Spirit of prophecy will be manifested among them.

To this also agree the words of Paul, recorded in 1 Corinthians 1:5-7: "That in everything ye are enriched by Him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Let it be noted that as the church waits "for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," she is to come behind in no gift. Therefore, all the gifts of the Spirit are to be found in her. And lest there should be a question about the gift of prophecy, this is especially mentioned by the inspired writer: "Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you." Verse 6. And "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy," or the prophetic gift.

Seventh-day Adventists believe that this gift of the Spirit was early manifested among them through the work and writings of Mrs. White. They believe that just as in past ages God raised up prophets and messengers to perform a special work for the church, and to counsel and warn God's people in times of special peril and need, so He raised up Mrs. White and bestowed upon her the gift of prophecy; and that He has used her life and work to bless and unify the church.

Some one perchance may be ready to say, "Then you have another Bible." We answer, No. That God sends special counsel, admonition, and help through some specially chosen servant is no evidence that the Bible is thus added to or taken

from. Were there not prophets and prophetesses in the apostolic church who gave counsel and instruction to the church in their day, but whose writings did not become a part of the Bible?

Luke tells us of one "Philip the evangelist," and says of his family, "The same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." Acts 21:9. Here, then, in the early church, were four prophetesses from one family. And while it is definitely stated that they exercised their gift and "did prophesy," yet no prophecy of theirs is recorded in the Bible.

In 1 Chronicles 29:29, 30, we read of two other prophets whom God raised up to do a work of local import, who wrote books, and whose influence extended over Israel and over all the kingdoms of the countries round about, and yet whose writings form no part of the Bible which was handed down to succeeding ages. "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer, with all his reign and his might, and the times that went over him, and over Israel, and over all the kingdoms of the countries."

Why should Nathan the prophet or Gad the seer have written books under inspiration of God, and then the books be allowed to be lost? We answer, Because God desired to give to the church in that day special counsel and instruction, warnings and entreaties that applied especially to that time and age, and that would not be "present truth" to succeeding ages.

The Bible contains the revealed will of God, and if followed, is sufficient to furnish men thoroughly unto all good works. (See 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.) It contains all the instruction necessary to salvation. But the difficulty is that men are so prone to wander away from the written word and ignore its silent witness, that it has been necessary from time to time for God to raise up an Elijah to call the people back to the worship

of the true God and the keeping of His commandments, and to destroy the heresies brought into the church by the priests of Baal. (See 1 Kings 18:17-41.)

Such is the work God has done through Mrs. White, and for this cause she was raised up. Her appeal was ever to the Bible. Her entire life was spent in a supreme effort to lead men to a clear understanding of the Book of God. She never claimed verbal inspiration for her writings; but she claimed that through the gift of the Spirit special light was shed upon the written word, and this has been written out in her own words and given to the church and the world for their edification.

We dare say that no candid person can read through one of the many volumes from her pen without being constrained to admit that thus many old familiar Bible texts are made to shine forth with new brilliancy and that many obscure passages have become clear and understandable. New rays of light are thus received, not because they are found in Mrs. White's writings, but because they now clearly shine forth from the Old Book. It is not a new or additional Bible that the church needs today, but inspired counsel that can help the befogged minds of the people of the world to grasp the glorious truths of the Bible we have.

Does some one reason that this gift is no longer necessary to the church? We inquire then, What mean the words of Peter when he said: "It shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God, I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on My servants and on My handmaidens I will pour out in those days of My Spirit; and they shall prophesy"? Acts 2:17, 18.

Here is a positive statement that the gift of prophecy will be seen in the church "*in the last days.*" And why not? Has God entirely removed Himself from His people? Is He not as

able today, as in former times, to give them needed counsel, reproof, and encouragement? Has the channel of communication between heaven and earth become so obstructed that nothing more can flow through? We think not; for in these last days of abounding iniquity God will have, as He has had in former ages, "a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but . . . holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:27), and He promises to enrich it with "all utterance," and "all knowledge," through the full bestowal of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Thus the church will "come behind in no gift," as it waits "for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (See 1 Cor. 1:5-7.)

When Mr. Canright was preaching for the Seventh-day Adventists, he was well aware that they made a distinction between the Bible and the writings of Mrs. White. And while still among them he wrote a clear testimony to that effect. Here it is:

"Right here let me say that we do not throw away the Bible, and take Mrs. White's visions instead. No; if there is a class of people under heaven who believe the Bible strongly, who love it devotedly, who study it and go to it for everything, it is Seventh-day Adventists. Here is our storehouse of doctrine and truth. We preach this everywhere and always. We have no other authority. We go to this to test and prove the genuineness of Sister White's labors and visions. If they did not harmonize with this in every particular, we would reject them. It is wicked for men to cry, 'The Bible, the Bible, the Bible,' and profess to follow that implicitly when they reject one of the plainest doctrines of the Bible,—the doctrine of spiritual gifts. Of course, I have no time here to take up an argument on spiritual gifts, or enter into a lengthy statement of her [Mrs. White's] labors, their nature, etc. We believe, however, that no doctrine of the Bible is plainer than that of the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, and particularly that these gifts are to be restored in the last days. Joel 2:28-32; Rev. 12:17; 19:10; 1 Thess. 5:1-21, etc."—*D. M. Canright, Review and Herald, April 19, 1877.*

In his later statement that "they [Seventh-day Adventists] have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons have" ("Adventism Renounced," p. 136), Mr. Canright stands con-

dicted by his former testimony. It seems difficult to believe that he was not willfully misrepresenting the facts as to the distinction well understood by the Seventh-day Adventists between the Bible and Mrs. White's writings.

Mrs. White has published to the world her own estimate of the absolute and final authority of the Scriptures, and of the relationship of her writings to the Bible. The following is from her pen:

"In His word, God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the revealer of doctrines, and the test of experience. 'Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.' 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, R. V.

"Yet the fact that God has revealed His will to men through His word, has not rendered needless the continued presence and the guiding of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the Spirit was promised by our Saviour, to open the word to His servants, to illuminate and apply its teachings. And since it was the Spirit of God that inspired the Bible, it is impossible that the teaching of the Spirit should ever be contrary to that of the word.

"The Spirit was not given—nor can it ever be bestowed—to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. Says the apostle John, 'Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.' 1 John 4:1. And Isaiah declares, 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.' Isa. 8:20."—*Mrs. E. G. White, in "The Great Controversy," p. vii.*

Mrs. White always emphatically declared that her writings were not to be considered an addition to the word of God, and that any one who claims this for them puts them "in a false light." Her Testimonies were intended to bring men to "a clearer understanding" of the Scriptures. On one occasion she wrote:

"Brother R. would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the Testimonies is an addition to the word of God; but in this he presents the matter in

a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of His people to His word, to give them a clearer understanding of it.' 'The word of God is sufficient to enlighten the most beclouded mind, and may be understood by those who have any desire to understand it. But notwithstanding all this, some who profess to make the word of God their study, are found living in direct opposition to its plainest teachings. Then, to leave men and women without excuse, God gives plain and pointed Testimonies, bringing them back to the word that they have neglected to follow.' 'The word of God abounds in general principles for the formation of correct habits of living, and the Testimonies, general and personal, have been calculated to call their attention more especially to these principles.'—*Mrs. E. G. White, in "Testimonies for the Church," Vol. V, pp. 663, 664.*

MRS. WHITE'S CHARACTER AND WORK

In his book Mr. Canright makes damaging statements regarding the character and personality of Mrs. White. Before quoting some of these, let us note a former statement regarding her character and work, written by him before he left the Seventh-day Adventists. The following was written by Mr. Canright in 1877:

"As to the Christian character of Sister White, I beg leave to say that I think I know something about it. I have been acquainted with Sister White for eighteen years, more than half the history of our people. I have been in their family time and again, sometimes weeks at a time. They have been in our house and family many times. I have traveled with them almost everywhere; have been with them in private and in public, in meeting and out of meeting, and have had the very best chances to know something of the life, character, and spirit of Brother and Sister White. As a minister, I have had to deal with all kinds of persons, and all kinds of character, till I think I can judge something of what a person is, at least after years of intimate acquaintance.

"I know Sister White to be an unassuming, modest, kind-hearted, noble woman. These traits in her character are not simply put on and cultivated, but they spring gracefully and easily from her natural disposition. She is not self-conceited, self-righteous, and self-important, as fanatics always are. I have frequently come in contact with fanatical persons, and I have always found them to be full of pretensions, full of pride, ready to give their opinion, boastful of their holiness, etc. But I have ever found Sister White the reverse of all this. Any one, the poorest and the humblest, can go to her freely for advice and comfort without being repulsed.

She is ever looking after the needy, the destitute, and the suffering, providing for them, and pleading their cause. I have never formed an acquaintance with any persons who so constantly have the fear of God before them. Nothing is undertaken without earnest prayer to God. She studies God's word carefully and constantly. I have heard Sister White speak hundreds of times, have read all her Testimonies through and through, most of them many times, and I have never been able to find one immoral sentence in the whole of them, or anything that is not strictly pure and Christian; nothing that leads away from the Bible, or from Christ; but there I find the most earnest appeals to obey God, to love Jesus, to believe the Scriptures, and to search them constantly. I have received great spiritual benefit times without number, from the Testimonies. Indeed, I never read them without feeling reproved for my lack of faith in God, lack of devotion, and lack of earnestness in saving souls. If I have any judgment, any spiritual discernment, I pronounce the Testimonies to be of the same Spirit and of the same tenor as the Scriptures.

"For thirty years these Testimonies have been believed and read among our people. How has it affected them? Has it led them away from the law of God? Has it led them to give up faith in Christ? Has it led them to throw aside the Bible? Has it led them to be a corrupt, immoral people? I know that they will compare favorably with any other Christian denomination. One thing I have remarked, and that is, that the most bitter opponents of the visions of Sister White admit that she is a Christian. How they can make this admission is more than I know. They try to fix it up by saying that she is deceived. They are not able to put their finger upon a single stain in all her life, nor an immoral sentence in all her writings. They have to admit that much of her writings are excellent, and that whoever would live out all she says would be a good Christian, sure of heaven. This is passing strange if she is a tool of the devil, inspired by Satan, or if her writings are immoral or the vagaries of her own mind."—*D. M. Canright, in Review and Herald, April 26, 1877.*

This earnest tribute to the character of Mrs. White, based upon an intimate acquaintance of eighteen years, was written in 1877. In 1885 he again bore testimony to his confidence in the integrity of Mrs. White's work:

"The tendency and influence of the Testimonies is not, like the teachings of Spiritualist mediums, to lead away from the Bible, away from God, and away from faith in Christ; nor, like Mormonism, to lead to sensuality, dishonesty, and crime; but they lead to faith in the Holy Scriptures, devotion to God, and a life of humility

and holiness. Can a corrupt tree bear good fruit? Jesus said not. What is a tree known by?—Its fruit. Here is a tree which has been standing among us for forty years, and bearing fruit. What has been the nature of that fruit? What have been its effects upon those who have partaken the most of it?

"It seems to me now that no one who has ever felt the power of the Spirit of God upon his own heart can candidly read through the four volumes of 'Spirit of Prophecy' without being deeply convicted that the writer must live very near to God, and be thoroughly imbued with the same Spirit that inspired the Bible, and animated the apostles and prophets. Such lofty thoughts of God, of heaven, and of spiritual things cannot come from a carnal heart, nor from a mind deceived and led by Satan. . . .

"You certainly know that our people hold all the cardinal doctrines of salvation,—faith in God, the Bible, Jesus Christ, repentance, a holy life, etc. Isn't this safe? You know that Sister White and all our ministers not only so teach, but exert all their influence to have our people live lives of devotion, of honesty, of purity, of love, of plainness, of sacrifice, and of every Christian virtue. You know that every sin is condemned among our people, and the most solemn warnings are constantly given against even the appearance of evil. You know that in almost every church of our people there are at least some who are living blameless Christian lives. You know that there is not one immoral doctrine taught or practiced by our people. Bad men and poor examples there are, to be sure; but they are such in spite of all our efforts to make them better. You know that if any man will strictly live up to the teachings of the Testimonies and our people, he will certainly be saved."—*D. M. Canright, in Review and Herald, Feb. 10, 1885, p. 85.*

These testimonials regarding Mrs. White and her writings express the sum of his convictions resulting from twenty-six out of the twenty-eight years of his labors among the Seventh-day Adventists. What shall we say regarding the consistency of entirely opposite statements, when we are asked to accept his derogatory caricature of this same individual, written just a few years later, at which time he declared?

"I long studied Mrs. White to determine for myself her real character till her case is clear to my mind."—"*Seventh-day Renounced,*" p. 137.

Let us note a few of his most flagrant contradictions on this point. From his volume under review we quote the following statements published in 1889:

"She has a harsh, uncharitable spirit. . . . Her severity and harshness have driven many to despair."—*Id.*, p. 160.

In 1877 he said:

"I know Sister White to be an unassuming, modest, kind-hearted, noble woman. These traits in her character are not simply put on and cultivated, but they spring gracefully and easily from her natural disposition."

In 1889 he says she "is simply a religious enthusiast, and a fanatic," and "is always telling what great things she has done." "Hear her laud herself."

In 1877 he testified of her:

"She is not self-conceited, self-righteous, and self-important, as fanatics always are. . . . I have ever found Sister White the reverse of all this."

Of her writings he said, in 1889:

"These inspired 'Testimonies' now embrace ten bound volumes. Thus they have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons have."—*Id.*, p. 136.

In 1877 he said of these same writings that there is "nothing that leads away from the Bible, or from Christ;" and in 1885, just four years before he wrote his renunciation of Adventism, he added: "The tendency and influence of her Testimonies is not, like the teachings of Spiritualist mediums, to lead away from the Bible, away from God, and away from faith in Christ; nor like Mormonism."

Now we submit to our readers that Mr. Canright could not have been sincere in both instances when these conflicting statements were made about the character and work of the same person. If he was sincere in his published utterances regarding Mrs. White in 1877, when he claims to have had eighteen years' acquaintance with her, and in 1885, at which time his acquaintance had lengthened to twenty-six years, then he could not have been sincere in 1889 when he clearly contradicted all that he had previously written of her. On the other hand, if he was sincere in his later statements, it surely proves insincerity on his part in what he had formerly said.

Mr. Canright also said of Mrs. White:

"Mrs. White received no school education, except a few weeks when a child. She, like Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee, and Joseph Smith, was wholly illiterate, not knowing the simplest rules of grammar."—*Id.*, p. 35.

What he failed to tell in connection with his portrayal of Mrs. White's gross ignorance, is how such a person managed to produce "ten bound volumes" which he calls the Seventh-day Adventist Bible. Usually persons in such a terrible state of mind and body, and with only a few weeks' schooling, do not become great authors.

After Mr. Canright published his book, this same woman continued to write and publish until the number of volumes produced by her increased to *thirty-six*, besides hundreds of articles published in religious journals, and many tracts and pamphlets. Her published volumes include some enlarged revisions of earlier publications, and when laid flat and stacked one on top of another, make a column higher than a man's head.

Many of her writings are highly regarded by Christians of all denominations. Her little volume, "Steps to Christ," ranks among the best sellers of religious books published in modern times, and has been translated into more than a score of languages. Her large Conflict of the Ages Series—"Patriarchs and Prophets," "Prophets and Kings," "The Desire of Ages," "Acts of the Apostles," and "The Great Controversy"—are studied by many ministers of other churches, and pronounced by them to be among the most helpful commentaries. Her work, "Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing," has brought blessings to thousands. Her volume, "Gospel Workers," insists upon a standard of purity and holiness for the ministry unsurpassed by any other publication, and the volumes of counsels to the church, of which Mr. Canright speaks, have brought light and courage, as well as instruction and reproof, to their many readers.

Mrs. White's books on the principles of Christian education, written for the guidance of teachers in the denominational colleges and schools, have been commended by educators of the world. The head of one training college for teachers, in one of the world's greatest cities, gave many copies of the book "Education" to his graduates, recommending it as the best book he knew on educational principles. In one country the staff of the university brought out the book "Education" in part, translating it from the English, and the university issued it for the benefit of educators.

Strange, this! An ignorant, sickly woman, with a bad temper, starts on a mission of deception, gets a following of people as illiterate as herself, and then, behold, she becomes a well-known author, producing some of the most prized religious books; goes on long lecture tours through many countries of the world, where thousands hang on her gracious words and are led to Christ through her labors! And stranger still, these ignorant followers of hers start colleges in all continents, conduct a Grade A medical school, operate sanitariums and large publishing houses in many lands, become noted for their piety, and extend their missions to nearly all countries of the earth. One would hardly have expected such excellent results from such an inauspicious beginning.

Shortly before Mr. Canright's change of church affiliation from the Seventh-day Adventist to the Baptist, he gave the following unsolicited testimonial for one of these books:

"I have read many books, but never one which has interested me so intensely and impressed me so profoundly as Volume IV, of 'The Great Controversy,' by Sister White. . . . The historical part is good, but that which was of the most intense interest to me, was the last part, beginning with 'The Origin of Evil.' The ideas concerning the nature and attributes of God, the character of Christ, and the rebellion of Lucifer in heaven, *carry with them their own proof of inspiration.* They moved the depths of my soul as nothing else ever did. I feel that I have a new and higher conception of the goodness and forbearance of God, the awful wickedness of Satan, and the tender love of Christ. I wish everybody could read it, whether of our people or not. Get it, brethren, and read

it carefully.”—*D. M. Canright, in Review and Herald, Jan. 6, 1885, page 9.*

We believe that to the unbiased reader it will already be apparent that in his eagerness to deal Seventh-day Adventists a fatal blow, Mr. Canright has caricatured the picture of Mrs. White. The things he says of her now, and the facts of her life’s work and influence as recognized by himself in earlier years, cannot be harmonized.

THE “MISTAKES” OF MRS. WHITE

In 1882 Elder Canright voluntarily left his ministry for the Seventh-day Adventists and retired to a farm. Of his attitude of mind at this time we have a description in a handwritten letter, written from Otsego, Michigan, December 9, 1883, addressed to “Dear Brother Long:”

“I am farming now, which keeps me very busy and hard at work. This is what I naturally love to do the best of anything, and so I feel well contented. I have entirely given up preaching, and have no intention of ever engaging in it again.”

“My faith in the whole thing has been shaken. As far as I can see at present much of it may be true or it may not be. I do not feel positive about any of these speculative points as I used to.”

“I am a member of the church still, and do all I can to help it. But if I were situated differently, would just as soon join some other church.”

In November, 1884, a general meeting was held at Otsego, during which Elder Canright’s faith was renewed, and he bore the following testimony:

“It seems to me, dear brethren, that my whole soul is now bound up in this present truth. I have told my brethren that if the world were before me, the truth is so clear that I know I could make them see it. I have also said that I do not believe any man takes as much pleasure in worldly pursuits as I do in this. I have tried to analyze my feelings, and I have reached some conclusions. Sometimes an individual gets started on a wrong train of reasoning, and he sees it when he is far away. Then he finds it hard to get back again. This was my case exactly. I did not see as the brethren did, and so I concluded I would leave the work for the time being. So I went to farming. . . .

"Now I want to say that I have been changed right around in my feelings and convictions. I do not say I am fully satisfied in everything; but I believe the truth as I used to believe it."—*Review and Herald, Vol. 61, No. 48, Dec. 2, 1884.*

Soon after this he contributed to the *Review and Herald* an article addressed "To Those in Doubting Castle." As to his personal experience he testified:

"Twenty-five years ago I embraced this message. The complete system of truth which it presented seemed to me something wonderful and very glorious. The study of the Bible was a continual feast to me. To preach it to others, and see them embrace it, filled my heart with gladness and peace. But at length things came up which threw me into doubt on some points, and finally were the occasion of my ceasing to preach the message. As the same things have affected others more or less and will be liable to affect still others in the future, I wish to give a few of the reasons why I still think that the work is all right, that the Lord is in it, and that these doubts are not well founded."—*Review and Herald, Vol. 62, No. 6, Feb. 10, 1885.*

In explaining his doubts regarding the Testimonies and his renewal of faith in them, he lays down the following general counsel:

"Are there not difficulties in these writings hard to explain? passages which seem to conflict one with another, or with some passage in the Bible, or with facts? I freely grant for myself that there are some passages which bother me, and which I do not know how to explain. But I believe them for all that, just as I do the Bible. There are many passages in the Bible which I should have to admit I could not explain nor harmonize. If any man says that he can explain and reconcile all the statements of the Scriptures, he simply shows his self-conceit and ignorance. Yet I profoundly believe the Bible for all that. . . .

"Peter admitted that there were some things in the Scriptures hard to be understood. 2 Peter 3:16. He says that some wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. And that is just what some are doing with the Testimonies. When we consider how extensive these writings are, extending over a period of nearly forty years, embracing ten bound volumes besides many smaller works, it would be a wonder indeed if in all these there should not be anything in the wording, the sentiment, or the doctrine, hard to understand and explain, or on which a sharp opponent could not make a plausible argument. We know that God's revelations in the past have not been given free from all obscurity and difficulties. Neither will they be now.

"If a man reads the Bible on purpose to find objections, as Tom Paine did and as Ingersoll does, he will find plenty of them to satisfy his unbelief, and confirm him in his infidelity. But if, like thousands of others equally learned and intelligent, he goes to the Scriptures to find light and God and salvation, he will find them full and clear, to the joy of his soul. I am profoundly convinced in the depths of my soul, after an experience of twenty-five years, that the same is true of the Testimonies."—*Ibid.*

It is well to consider these principles in dealing with some of the passages in the writings of Mrs. White that are later given by Mr. Canright as evidence that the Testimonies are unreliable and faulty. Considering the vast number of pages combed by the critics of these writings, there is a surprisingly small number of points that can be brought forward in the effort to belittle the work of their author. The reader of that part of Mr. Canright's book dealing with the teachings of Mrs. White will note that there are many quotations of a line or two here and a brief sentence there, woven together by arguments in such a way as to make them serve the purpose of the critic. Most of the supposed difficulties would disappear were the context of the quotations given.

Striking examples of this are seen in a number of garbled sentences taken from their setting, which he lists under the heading, "Her Predictions About the Rebellion a Failure." We will notice these in order. He cites first the words of Mrs. White: "The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion." Then our critic comments: "Was slavery left to live and stir up another rebellion? Now we know that that statement is utterly untrue."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 148.

In its setting, this sentence quoted from Mrs. White will be seen not to have been intended as her prediction. It is a statement of the thoughts of others, as expressing their feelings at that time. Here is the entire paragraph, a reading of which will remove all grounds for listing this as a "mistake."

"Those who have ventured to leave their homes and sacrifice their lives to exterminate slavery, are dissatisfied. They see no

good results from the war, only the preservation of the Union, and for this thousands of lives must be sacrificed and homes made desolate. Great numbers have wasted away and expired in hospitals; others have been taken prisoners by the rebels, a fate more to be dreaded than death. In view of all this, they inquire, If we succeed in quelling this rebellion, what has been gained? They can only answer discouragingly, Nothing. That which caused the rebellion is not removed. *The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion.* The feelings of thousands of our soldiers are bitter. They suffer the greatest privations; these they would willingly endure, but they find they have been deceived, and they are dispirited. Our leading men are perplexed; their hearts are failing them for fear. They fear to proclaim freedom to the slaves of the rebels, for by so doing they will exasperate that portion of the South who have not joined the rebellion but are strong slavery men."—"*Testimonies,*" Vol. I, pp. 254, 255, dated Jan. 4, 1862.

Thus it is seen that Mrs. White was simply expressing the fears of others as to what the outcome of the Civil War might be, rather than predicting that it would surely be so.

"Again," continues Mr. Canright, as an instance of a failure of prediction, "It seemed impossible to have the war conducted successfully.' Another failure, for it was conducted successfully."—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,*" p. 148.

The setting of this sentence also shows that it was not intended as a prediction, but merely as a statement of fact as it existed at the time of writing, which was during the Civil War. Note the statement with its context:

"A great share of the volunteers enlisted, fully believing that the result of the war would be to abolish slavery. Others enlisted intending to be very careful to keep slavery just as it is, but to put down the rebellion and preserve the Union. And then to make the matter still more perplexing and uncertain, some of the officers in command are strong proslavery men, whose sympathies are all with the South, yet who are opposed to a separate government. *It seems impossible to have the war conducted successfully,* for many in our own ranks are continually working to favor the South, and our armies have been repulsed, and unmercifully slaughtered, on account of the management of these proslavery men."—"*Testimonies,*" Vol. I, p. 256, dated January 4, 1862.

In its setting the statement quoted cannot be criticized. Isolated from the obvious reason contained in the latter part

of the sentence, and with even the tense of the verb changed in order to make it appear like a prediction, it gives a meaning not intended by the writer.

"Here is another, 'This nation will yet be humbled into the dust.' Was it? No."—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," by D. M. Canright, p. 148.

Considering the long, sorrowful record of defeat and disaster of the Northern Army during the first year of the Civil War, before the tide of victory turned to its side, it is hardly a stretch of language to admit that it was then humbled in the dust, though it later rose to triumph. Mr. Canright further challenges Mrs. White, in these words:

"Again, 'When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war.' Did anything of this kind happen? No."—*Ibid.*

The following statement taken from one of Mrs. White's books and from which Mr. Canright has extracted the above sentence, can hardly be said to be a prediction. It was written during an early period in the Civil War, was simply picturing conditions as they existed at the time of writing, and reference is made to the influences which were at work among the outside nations. She says:

"England is studying whether it is best to take advantage of the present weak condition of our nation, and venture to make war upon her. She is weighing the matter, and trying to sound other nations. She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home and that other nations would take advantage of her weakness. Other nations are making quiet yet active preparations for war, and are hoping that England will make war with our nation, for then they would improve the opportunity to be revenged on her for the advantage she has taken of them in the past, and the injustice done them. A portion of the Queen's subjects are waiting a favorable opportunity to break their yoke; but if England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate a moment to improve her opportunities to exercise her power, and humble our nation. *When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion.*"—*Testimonies*," Vol. I, p. 259.

It seems to us that the context here shows clearly that it was still a question whether or not England would declare war. "If England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate." England was represented as studying whether or not it would pay to make war upon America. She was "weighing the matter, and trying to sound out other nations." She was fearful of weakness at home, etc. But it is stated that should she finally decide to launch upon a war with America, all nations would then have an interest of their own to serve, and there would be general war and confusion.

But even granting, for the sake of argument, that this was intended as a prediction, and that at the time when Mr. Canright wrote his book nothing of the kind had happened, if he had written his book this side of 1914, when England and Germany declared war and threw the civilized world into a death struggle, would he so flippantly have held this prediction up to ridicule? For with the World War came an experience like that which was here foretold. Moreover, in the light of present-day uncertainty, who dare assert that the world might not again be precipitated into an awful holocaust, following a declaration of war by England?

"Once more, 'Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided it must fall.' How it did fall!"—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, by D. M. Canright, p. 148.

Here again the context shows that this statement quoted by Mr. Canright is expressive merely of the viewpoint of other nations, and is not a prediction by Mrs. White at all:

"The weakness of our government is fully open before other nations, and *they now conclude* that it is because it was not a monarchical government, and they admire their own government, and look down, some with pity, others with contempt, upon our nation, which they have regarded as the most powerful upon the globe. *Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided it must fall.*"—*Testimonies*, Vol. I, pp. 259, 260.

This entire chapter, from which these few quotations are garbled by Mr. Canright, may be found in "Testimonies for

the Church," Volume I, pages 253-260. The utterances stand today just as they were written early in the Civil War, and Seventh-day Adventists still put this forth, confident that those who will read it in its entirety, and with its obvious meaning, and compare it with history as it has been confirmed by later records, will find nothing to criticize.

Instead of predicting final failure for the North in the Civil War, Mrs. White clearly intimated when and by what means the tide of victory would be turned. Here it is in this same chapter :

"The manner in which the poor slaves have been treated has led them to believe that their masters have told them the truth in these things. And yet a national fast is proclaimed! Saith the Lord, 'Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?' When our nation observes the fast which God has chosen [i. e., liberating the slaves], then will He accept their prayers as far as the war is concerned; but now they enter not into His ear."—*Page 258.*

At the lowest ebb in the fortunes of war with the South, President Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation. From that time began the successes of the North, soon resulting in victory. Can it be possible that Mr. Canright overlooked this prediction, which certainly was fulfilled? It must be so, for he says :

"I could give scores of such quotations all through her writings, showing how they have failed, *always and everywhere*" (italics ours).—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," by D. M. Canright, p. 149.

In an attempt to arouse patriotic indignation against Mrs. White, Mr. Canright quotes one other isolated sentence from an article on "The Rebellion." This perversion of her meaning and misrepresentation of her loyalty should be noticed :

"Again, 'Blood has been poured out like water, and for naught.' Was it for naught, ye brave soldiers? ye liberated slaves? ye freed nation?"—*Id.*, pp. 148, 149.

The context shows that Mrs. White was here referring to blood that had been needlessly shed by the mismanagement of men in the Northern Army who were in sympathy with slavery. No one rejoiced more over the "liberated slaves" and the "freed nation" than did she. This is what she wrote:

"Many professed Union men, holding important positions, are disloyal at heart. Their only object in taking up arms was to preserve the Union as it was, and slavery with it. They would heartily chain down the slave to his life of galling bondage, had they the privilege. Such have a strong degree of sympathy with the South. *Blood has been poured out like water, and for naught.* In every town and village there is mourning. Wives are mourning for their husbands, mothers for their sons, and sisters for their brothers."—*"Testimonies," Vol. I, p. 367.*

When the reader reflects that this statement was made during the war, and not after, the true meaning is clearly understood.

Again Mr. Canright quotes from Mrs. White: "'The nations are now getting angry.'—*'Early Writings,' p. 29.*" He then remarks: "That was thirty-eight years ago. It takes a long time for them to get fighting mad."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," by D. M. Canright, p. 146.*

Here again Mr. Canright spoke too soon by several years, and was too optimistic that "peace on earth and good will toward men" was to be the order of the day. We ask, Did they not get fighting mad before and during the recent World War? And is there yet any assurance of lasting peace among the nations? It would appear that in this matter, as in very many others, Mr. Canright, instead of Mrs. White, was the one who made a mistake and figured things out wrongly.

THE REFORM DRESS

"One of the worst blunders Mrs. White ever made," says Mr. Canright, "was the move she made on dress."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 149.*

The issue thus raised is due to the fact that at a time when

tight corsets were worn, when hoops were in fashion, and when women's dresses were dragging behind and mopping up the filth of the streets, Mrs. White, like some other reformers, advocated a reform dress for women. She urged that women's dresses should "clear the filth of the streets" at least an inch or two, and that nine inches would be better; that for warmth an appropriate undergarment should be worn to protect the lower limbs—pantalettes, these were sometimes called. Now to Mr. Canright this "was a shame and a disgrace." "Think," says he, "of a modest woman on the street with pants on, and her dress cut off halfway up to the knees!"—"*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*," p. 149.

And yet a little later the shears in the hands of fashion leaders began to work, and inch by inch the skirts were clipped until they were six to nine inches from the ground, then just below the knee, then above the knee. True, conservative and modest women did not carry the clipping process quite so far, but stopped at about nine inches from the ground—just where Mrs. White and other reformers of her day advocated that the skirts should stop. And today a modest woman can go about the streets with her "dress cut halfway up to the knees" and not have her modesty questioned in the least degree. In fact, that length of skirt is of the conservative style, and is taken as an evidence of modesty on the part of the wearer. The reform dress, therefore, only slightly modified from what was originally advocated, is now the prevailing style, minus, however, the protection to the lower limbs suggested by Mrs. White.

Without giving undue space to this subject, we think attention should be called to the most glaring misrepresentations, made by the use of garbled quotations, in Mr. Canright's treatment of this question.

As an instance of direct contradiction, Mr. Canright quotes two sentences from Mrs. White, out of their setting, thus: "God would not have His people adopt the so-called reform dress" ("*Testimonies*," Vol. I, page 421), and a statement written four

years later, "God would now have His people adopt the reform dress."—*Id.*, p. 525.

And here is Mr. Canright's explanation of this seeming contradiction?

"What occasioned this change in the mind of the Lord? The answer is easy: In the time between the two revelations Mrs. White had spent some time at Dr. Jackson's Home, Dansville, New York. Here a short dress with pants was worn, and she fell in with the idea, and soon had a vision requiring its adoption as above."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 149.

The whole question becomes clear when it is stated that there were two distinct styles of dress referred to. In the first quotation, let the reader notice that it is the "so-called" reform dress, that was condemned by Mrs. White. The one referred to thus is what was known as the "American costume." In this costume the dress was very short, and the pants worn made the wearer look mannish.

That Mrs. White was consistent in condemning this, even while recommending another style of "reform dress," is indicated by the following quotation from a report of meetings written by James White:

"During the meetings up to this date, Mrs. White has taken the opportunity to explain and harmonize her Testimonies on the dress question, showing the difference between the reform dress and the 'American costume,' that while the first mentioned style of dress reaches to about the top of a lady's boot, the 'American costume' does not reach to the knee."—*Review and Herald, Jan. 15, 1867.*

Although Mr. Canright was, as we shall prove, familiar with this distinction, and with Mrs. White's consistent attitude in condemning the one while recommending a better, yet he sets out as an apparent contradiction two statements, one referring to the "American costume," and the other the reform dress as it was later developed. That the reader may be assured that it was this ultra-short "American costume" that was condemned, it is necessary only to consider Mrs. White's words in their setting. Here is the quotation as it stands:

"I saw that God's order has been reversed, and His special directions disregarded by those who adopt the *American costume*. I was referred to Deuteronomy 22:5: 'The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment, for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.'

"*God would not have His people adopt the so-called reform dress*. It is immodest apparel, wholly unfitted for the modest, humble followers of Christ."—"*Testimonies*," Vol. I, p. 421.

Elder Canright's plausible explanation as to Mrs. White's change of mind—though in fact there was no change—is that she adopted a style that she saw at the "Home" in Dansville. We are fortunate in having in her own handwriting a letter written by her during that visit to which Mr. Canright makes reference. Here is what she wrote regarding the dress as she saw it worn there:

"They have all styles of dress here. Some are very becoming, if not so short. We shall get patterns from this place, and I think we can get out a style of dress more healthful than we now wear, and yet not be bloomer or the American costume. Our dresses, according to my idea, should be from four to six inches shorter than now worn, and should in no case reach lower than the top of the heel of the shoe, and could be a little shorter even than this with all modesty. I am going to get up a style of dress on my own hook, which will accord perfectly with that which has been shown me. Health demands it. Our feeble women must dispense with heavy skirts and tight waists if they value health. . . .

"We shall never imitate Miss Dr. Austin or Mrs. Dr. York. They dress very much like men. *We shall imitate or follow no fashion we have ever yet seen*. We shall institute a fashion which will be both economical and healthy."—*From a letter to "Brother and Sister Lockwood," dated September, 1864.*

From this letter it will be noted that all that Mrs. White claimed as being given by revelation regarding dress was the principles that should prevail. It is evident that she was seeking a style which she could recommend, a style that should be modest, healthful, becoming, and economical. She, with others connected with the Health Institute in Battle Creek, worked out the details of a costume that was adopted by the ladies at the health institution, and so recommended itself by

its good sense that some of the patients adopted it, and took patterns away with them upon their return home.

Regarding some of the details connected with the introduction at the Health Institute of a reform dress in harmony with the principles of health and modesty, we have the following statement:

"When the Health Reform Institute was established, the physicians decided that a better style of dress for women than the long, dragging skirts, was desirable. . . . The physicians declared it was not only desirable, but necessary in the treatment of some cases; and that being so, it would be useless and wrong to receive such cases without adopting what they were assured was essential to effect cures. Again, it seemed to be understood and conceded by all health reformers who had investigated the subject, that a reform dress was necessary, and if it was not adopted at the Institute, a class of patients would surely be driven to other institutions, where something different from the prevailing fashion was adopted. Therefore to neglect this reform would be to sacrifice the best interests of the Institute, and of a certain class who most needed its benefits. . . .

"As might be expected, when it was first being adopted at the Institute there was not complete uniformity, but the taste and choice of the wearers had much to do with the length and appearance of the dresses worn. . . .

"At my request the physicians at the Institute named a number of its inmates whose dresses they considered as nearly correct in make and appearance as could be found to that number among the varieties. I measured the height of twelve, with the distance of their dresses from the floor. They varied in height from five feet to five seven inches, and the distance of the dresses from the floor was from 8 to 10½ inches. The medium, nine inches, was decided to be the right distance, and is adopted as the standard."—*Health Reformer, March, 1868.*

While it is true that positive testimony was borne by Mrs. White regarding the need of dress reform, and certain principles that should be adopted, yet it was the physicians and others at the sanitarium, as shown above—doubtless in collaboration with Mrs. White, who was then living in Battle Creek—who experimented, designed, modeled, and recommended it as a dress that conformed to health principles. She urged its adoption, as being consistent with the principles she had been shown.

At the time when the dress reform was agitated by Mrs. White, it was impossible to devise any sort of healthful costume that would not be so far from the prevailing fashions as to arouse ridicule from the devotees of fashion. In later years, when more healthful styles were adopted, Mrs. White expressed her pleasure that Christians could wear healthful and modest clothes without appearing singular.

Mr. Canright says of the reform dress:

"It created a terrible commotion. Husbands swore, brothers refused to walk with their sisters, men sneered, and boys hooted."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* pp. 149, 150.

Mrs. White, however, was not responsible for any trouble in families created by the reform dress, for she distinctly cautioned her sisters against taking a course to which there was opposition on the part of their husbands:

"Sisters who have opposing husbands have asked my advice in regard to their adopting the short dress contrary to the wishes of the husband. I advised them to wait. . . . The opposition which many might receive should they adopt the dress reform, would be more injurious to health than the dress would be beneficial."—*"Testimonies,"* Vol. I, p. 522.

But not all husbands were, as Mr. Canright intimates, opposed to the new costume recommended by Mrs. White. Here is the testimony of one husband:

"The modesty of the short dress is not the smallest thing to be considered. Any one that has traveled as much as I have, can bear testimony with me to the immodesty of the hoop skirt. A lady with one on very seldom enters a carriage, omnibus, car, and such places, without immodestly exposing herself. But with the reform dress on, all exposure is entirely avoided. After seeing it worn, I think it is the most modest dress I have ever seen, and I am not alone in this opinion."—*Review and Herald, June 18, 1867.*

This husband was D. M. Canright, who expressed this opinion before he severed himself from the Seventh-day Adventists. And we have the most positive evidence that Mr. Canright understood the difference between the "American costume," which Mrs. White from the first condemned as

immodest, and the reform dress which was adopted. In a report of a meeting, in which he set forth the advantages of the reform dress, he says, immediately following the paragraph just quoted:

"Nearly all decided in favor of it, and others had but very slight objections to it. . . . *The reform dress and the American costume are two very different things. All could readily see this.*"—*Ibid.*

In giving the history of the reform dress agitation, it should be recognized that good judgment was not always used by those who made the change. And no one more than Mrs. White deplored this fact. Thus she says:

"In some places there is great opposition to the short dress. But when I see some dresses worn by the sisters, I do not wonder that people are disgusted, and condemn the dress. Where the dress is represented as it should be, all candid persons are constrained to admit that it is modest and convenient."—"Testimonies," Vol. I, p. 521.

The reader who desires to judge for himself as to the good sense manifested in Mrs. White's advocacy of a health reform dress, is referred to a chapter entitled, "The Reform Dress," in "Testimonies for the Church," Volume I, pages 521-525.

WAS MRS. WHITE ILLITERATE?

Was Mrs. White an illiterate fanatic as she is pictured by Mr. Canright? We answer: Ask any one who has ever heard her speak or who has ever read her five large books in the Conflict of the Ages series. Let any candid man or woman take up one of these volumes and read it through, and then answer the question. These books, while written in simple language, are elegant in style and profound in their teaching. They appeal to both the intellect and the heart. Preachers from other denominations have often quoted from her writings because of the richness of expression and clarity of thought found there.

Is this the work of an illiterate fanatic? The question answers itself.

It is true that Mrs. White did not have the advantage of a college education; neither did Abraham Lincoln, nor Professor Butler, president of the University of Missouri, who stopped school at the age of thirteen, neither did James nor John nor Matthew. Were they therefore ignorant fanatics? If her scholastic attainments were meager, then all the greater glory attaches to God for the mighty work He accomplished through her. She was probably one of the best educated religious leaders of her day, not in technical, worldly wisdom, but in an understanding of the Scriptures. Like Apollos of Alexandria, she was "eloquent, . . . and mighty in the Scriptures." Acts 18:24. The fact that she had been handicapped in her schooling and yet produced such marvelous volumes filled with truths so deep and sublime as to stir the very souls of untold thousands, is one of the strongest testimonies that can be borne to the fact that God was with her.

Of Jesus we are told that as He taught in the temple in Jerusalem, "the Jews marveled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" John 7:15.

There is an education that comes through personal study, close application, prayer, and meditation, that may far exceed that to be had in the schools of the world, and this is what Mrs. White had. And besides this, those who were best acquainted with her life and work, and who are the closest students of her teachings, have no hesitancy in saying that, through the gift of prophecy she had access to stores of divine knowledge that enabled her to flood the Scriptures with a light and radiance hitherto unseen since the papal apostasy of the Dark Ages all but obliterated Bible truth from the minds of men.

On one occasion the leading citizens of Battle Creek, Michigan, arranged a meeting for her to speak on some subject of her own choosing, and publicly invited her in the *Daily Journal* to do so on the occasion of her visit there after a camp meeting which she had attended in Grand Rapids. She complied, and spoke to a large congregation. This shows clearly

whether she was considered a "fanatic," or one unworthy to speak in any "pulpit." The following report of the meeting appeared in the *Battle Creek Journal* of October 5, 1887:

"There was a good attendance, including a large number of our most prominent people, at the lecture of Mrs. Ellen G. White, at the Tabernacle, last evening.

"This lady gave her audience a most eloquent discourse, which was listened to with marked interest and attention. Her talk was interspersed with instructive facts which she had gathered in her recent visit to foreign lands, and demonstrated that this gifted lady has, in addition to her many other rare qualifications, a great faculty for attentive, careful observation, and a remarkable memory of details. This, together with her fine delivery and her faculty of clothing her ideas in choice, beautiful, and appropriate language, made her lecture one of the best that has ever been delivered by any lady in our city. That she may soon favor our community with another address, is the earnest wish of all who attended last evening; and should she do so, there will be a large attendance."—*Quoted in the Review and Herald, Oct. 11, 1877.*

Years later, after Mr. Canright's book was in circulation, in which he so shamefully maligns Mrs. White, branding her as a fanatic, a deceiver, an impostor, etc., this same man attended her funeral, and as he stood by her casket with his brother, B. J. Canright, with tears in his eyes he said, "There's a noble woman gone." This statement is attested to by his brother in writing.*

Mr. Canright was under no obligation of any kind to be present at the funeral of Mrs. White, much less to offer any eulogy of her life or character. In view of this, his spontaneous statement, "There's a noble woman gone," stands in striking contrast to the defamatory statements he made concerning her after he left the denomination, and which he published both before and after her death.

* Prof. M. L. Andreasen, now (1933) president of Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska, contributes under date of January 17, 1933, this word confirming the statement made by B. J. Canright:

"I was one of the guards of honor when the body of Mrs. E. G. White lay in state in the Tabernacle in Battle Creek, Michigan, and was on duty at the time Mr. Canright approached the casket. I heard the above words uttered by Mr. D. M. Canright, and testify to their correctness.

(Signed) "M. L. ANDREASEN."

THE SHUT DOOR QUESTION

Mr. Canright launches a thrust against the Seventh-day Adventists, and particularly against Mrs. E. G. White, because for some time after the disappointment of 1844 they believed in the "shut door" theory, that is, that probation for sinners had closed.

Everybody acknowledges that the followers of William Miller believed Jesus was coming in 1844. And believing that, how could they have thought otherwise than that probation for the whole world would close at that time? That Mrs. White and her associates at one time believed thus we do not deny. Indeed, she herself frankly admits that fact.

In the troubled period that immediately followed 1844, when they were endeavoring to understand the prophecies more fully in order to discover where their mistake was, various views were set forth by different leaders of the former advent body. A full knowledge of God's truth did not come in a day, nor even in a year. But gradually, as they continued to study the Bible, mistakes of interpretation were discovered. It was seen that while Christ's coming is indeed near, "even at the doors," the day and the hour of that coming are not revealed in the Scriptures, and that the task before them was a world-wide one of preaching that soon-coming advent to "every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

Their view concerning those who could still be saved was broadened as God's plan for these last days became clear to their minds. God did not see fit to make them incapable of any error in their early endeavors to learn what the Bible taught regarding the advent. God has never seen fit to do that.

The disciples of Christ had to pass through a period of sadly mistaken ideas regarding Christ's first advent and the number who were to be afforded opportunity for salvation. They thought that Christ would set up His kingdom on the earth at that time. They held this view even after the resurrection, so wrongly had they interpreted the prophecies regard-

ing the Saviour. And when they began to preach the gospel, they so definitely held that it was only for Israel that they took Peter to task for preaching to the Gentiles. Peter himself had gone to preach to them only after the Lord had specifically instructed him to go. And when Peter related how the Holy Ghost had fallen upon the Gentiles, the apostles exclaimed with mingled surprise and joy, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts 11:18. According to the chronology in the margin of the Bible, this particular preaching by Peter occurred about eight years after the apostles began to proclaim the gospel message of a risen Christ!

We may regret that they, the pioneers of the Christian religion, were so "slow of heart" to understand God's purposes regarding the first advent of Christ and the founding of the Christian religion; we may even marvel that those men who had been tutored by Christ Himself for three years did not more quickly learn, yet we find in all this no reason for doubt as to the divine origin of Christianity or the divine guidance of the apostles. Then why should any one attempt to frame a charge against the second advent movement simply because the pioneers of that movement held at first a faulty and limited view of the second advent of Christ?

"But," some one will say, "we will grant that no charge should be brought against the Seventh-day Adventist denomination because the pioneers in general held, for a time, the belief that their message was only for a limited number, and that the probation of the world at large was closed. But Mr. Canright brings the more serious charge that Mrs. E. G. White, whom you declare had the prophetic gift, also believed and taught for a time those same faulty views regarding the close of probation. How do you answer this?"

We would answer by dividing the inquiry into two parts: First, did Mrs. White believe, in common with other pioneers, the faulty view of the second advent doctrine regarding the close of probation and the salvation of sinners? We answer,

Yes, even as the apostles, whom God used to write much of the New Testament, held, for a time, faulty ideas regarding the first advent and the salvation of sinners; second, did Mrs. White, in those writings that she declared were revelations from God given in vision, set forth a wrong view of the close of probation, or the "shut door," as it was called? To this last question, which is the only one that has any proper bearing on the claim of divine leadership in the Seventh-day Adventist movement, we answer emphatically, No.

Away back in 1874 Mrs. White wrote in a letter an answer to the very charge we are here examining. The portion of her letter dealing with this matter is here reproduced:

"BATTLE CREEK, MICH.,
Aug. 24, 1874.

"DEAR BRO. LOUGHBOROUGH:

"I hereby testify in the fear of God that the charges of Miles Grant, of Mrs. Burdick, and others published in the *Crisis* is not true. The statements in reference to my course in forty-four [1844] is false.

"With my brethren and sisters, after the time passed in forty-four I did believe no more sinners would be converted. But I never had a vision that no more sinners would be converted. And am clear and free to state no one has ever heard me say or has read from my pen statements which will justify them in the charges they have made against me upon this point.

"It was on my first journey east to relate my visions that the precious light in regard to the heavenly sanctuary was opened before me and I was shown the open and shut door. We believed that the Lord was soon to come in the clouds of heaven. I was shown that there was a great work to be done in the world for those who had not had the light and rejected it. Our brethren could not understand this with our faith in the immediate appearing of Christ. Some accused me of saying my Lord delayeth His coming, especially the fanatical ones. I saw that in '44 God had opened a door and no man could shut it and shut a door and no man could open it. Those who rejected the light which was brought to the world by the message of the second angel went into darkness, and how great was that darkness.

"I never have stated or written that the world was doomed or damned. I never have under any circumstances used this language to any one, however sinful. I have ever had messages of reproof for those who used these harsh expressions."

Turning to a more detailed statement concerning Mrs. White's teachings in the early days of the movement, we find these facts, as set forth by A. G. Daniells, who has made an exhaustive study of her writings:

"So far as I can learn from the documents in our possession, I have given the correct citation to everything that came from the pen of Mrs. White from 1844 to the close of 1851, and I have given every line of her statements regarding the shut door and the close of probation questions. Here is what we find:

"1. That during that period of six years there were printed in various forms twenty-five separate messages, articles, and letters from the pen of Mrs. E. G. White.

"2. That in only five articles or letters of this number is there any reference made to the shut door and the close of probation.

"3. That in not one of the five references to the shut door does Mrs. White state that the door of the second apartment of the sanctuary in which Christ ministers as High Priest or Mediator for a lost world, was closed in 1844. Nor does she once state that there was no salvation for any sinners after 1844.

"4. That in all that was printed from the pen of Mrs. White during the eight years,—1844-1851,—we find three statements so worded that two different and conflicting interpretations can be placed upon them. But this is not to be counted as strange, for we find the same perplexity in certain passages of Scripture. The views here maintained make the statements harmonious with the general tenor of the messages of which they are parts, and with all the rest of her printed messages.

"The writer believes that any one who will study this subject impartially, with only the desire to arrive at the truth, must come to the conclusion that while the early Adventists—i. e., those who were disappointed in 1844—believed for a time that probation closed on the tenth day of the seventh month, and even if Mrs. E. G. White for a time shared personally this view in common with those with whom she associated, there is no evidence to show that she ever put it forth as revealed to her from the Lord. The statements relied upon by some to show this, do not prove it. And it is certain that other things she wrote between 1844 and 1851 are entirely inconsistent with such a view."

We would call the reader's particular attention to the last sentence of this quotation. During the very years that she wrote certain statements which opponents have insisted must be understood as teaching a false view of probation, she also wrote certain other statements that are entirely inconsistent

with this false view. But to her opponents this can mean simply that her writings contain not only errors but contradictions. Yet those very opponents, in meeting the Bible skeptic's charge of errors and contradictions, would contend that if the skeptic was only willing to place another interpretation on certain Bible statements, the supposed errors would vanish and also the contradictions. And their contention would be just. On this very principle that a writer's statements should, if possible, be interpreted so as to be harmonious one with the other, we remove the majority of the so-called contradictions and difficulties of the Bible. And this principle is a sound one to employ, not simply on the Bible, but on any literary work. Is there any just reason why we should not invoke it in examining the writings of Mrs. White? When we do, the charges against her collapse.

CHAPTER XVII

MR. CANRIGHT'S REMARKABLE ADMISSION

ON page 49 of "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," Mr. Canright makes a strange admission of insincerity. He tells of the time when he was still a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and when he temporarily dropped out of ministerial work and went onto a farm. After spending two years on the farm, he attended a camp meeting and made the confession referred to by us in Chapter I. Of this experience he says:

"In the fall of 1884, Elder Butler, my old friend, and now at the head of the advent work, made a great effort to get me reconciled and back at work again. He wrote me several times, to which I made no answer. Finally he telegraphed me, and paid my fare to a camp meeting. Here I met old friends and associations, tried to see things as favorable as possible, heard explanations, etc., etc., till at last I yielded again. I was sick of an undecided position. I thought I could do some good here anyway; all my friends were here; I believed much of the doctrine still, and I might go to ruin if I left them, etc. Now I resolved to swallow all my doubts, believe the whole thing anyway, and stay with them for better or for worse. So I made a strong confession, *of which I was ashamed before it was cold.*"—"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," p. 49.

The confession to which he refers is the one made at the time when he had a wonderful experience with God, to which we referred in Chapter I. In it he declared: "*I am fully satisfied that my own salvation and my usefulness in saving others depends upon my being connected with this people and this work.*" He tells of a reconversion, "the most remarkable change that I ever experienced in all my life."

Now, in his book, he informs us that he was ashamed of this confession before it was cold. And yet, *after* it was cold,

and after the meeting at which it was made was adjourned, he published it in the church paper! Ashamed of it, and yet publishes it! What would such an admission be called if made in court, and what standing as a witness could one have after making such a statement?

Nor is this the worst. In relating his experience at the time of making this confession, he declared that the Holy Spirit was working upon his heart. Said he: "I never felt such a change before, not even when first converted, nor when I embraced the message, nor at any other time. I believe it was directly from heaven—the work of the Spirit of God."—*D. M. Canright, in Review and Herald, Oct. 7, 1884.*

And yet he was "ashamed" of this confession "before it was cold." Think of it! A clergyman has a remarkable experience, publicly attributes it to the work of the Spirit of God, and then almost immediately is ashamed of this public utterance because it is insincere! What shall this be called?

How, then, shall a man who has thus made a mockery of the work of the Holy Spirit come forth in two or three years' time as a Moses to lead the people of God out of darkness and deliver them from a "yoke of bondage"? Is he not of those against whom Isaiah warned the church, saying: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" Isa. 5:20.

THE TRINITY

In Chapter I, page 25, paragraph 2 of his work, he professes to enumerate the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist Church that differ from those held by other evangelical churches. His very first statement of these differences is, "*They reject the doctrine of the Trinity.*" Had Mr. Canright said that when he was among them there were some Seventh-day Adventists who did not believe the doctrine of the Trinity, it might have been difficult to challenge his statement. But his

sweeping indictment, involving, as it does, the whole denomination, is not true today, nor was it true when made. And this Mr. Canright well knew, for in an article which he published in the *Review and Herald*, the Seventh-day Adventist Church paper, under date of April 12, 1877, he himself had said:

"Do we not all agree that in the providence of God, special light is now being given upon the subjects of the second advent near, the kingdom, the new earth, the sleep of the dead, the destruction of the wicked, the doctrine of the Trinity, the law of God, God's holy Sabbath, etc.? All Seventh-day Adventists will agree in these things."

For many years our theological schools have taught the doctrine of the Trinity very definitely, and for almost as many years it has appeared incidentally in some of our denominational books. For example, we quote this from page 671 of "The Desire of Ages," by Mrs. E. G. White, printed in 1898:

"Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the *third person of the Godhead*, who would come with no modified energy, but in the fullness of divine power. It is the Spirit that makes effectual what has been wrought out by the world's Redeemer."

In the statement of belief found in the Seventh-day Adventist "Church Manual," which sets forth the official discipline and doctrinal position of the denomination, is found this statement on the subject of the Trinity:

"That the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, a personal spiritual Being, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, infinite in wisdom and love; the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, through whom all things were created and through whom the salvation of the redeemed hosts will be accomplished; the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, the great regenerating power in the work of redemption."—"*Church Manual*," p. 180.

Doubtless there were those of a different opinion when Mr. Canright was an Adventist, as there may be such individuals even today, but a denial of the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be justly charged against Seventh-day Adventists as a body, and never could, for in their earlier history the issue was

not raised, and when later on it was raised, it was decided, not by official vote, but by common consent, in favor of the Bible doctrine of three persons in the Godhead—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

A BROOD OF ERRORS AND HERESIES

Another deliberate effort to confuse the issue and to create a false impression regarding the belief of Seventh-day Adventists is found on pages 74 and 75 of Mr. Canright's book. We quote him as follows:

"What do Adventists believe? Go ask what language was spoken by the people after the Lord confused their tongues at Babel. . . . Such a brood of errors and heresies as has resulted from Adventism, cannot be found in the history of the church before. Time setting, visions, miracles, fanatics, false prophets, sleep of the dead, annihilation of the wicked, nonresurrection of the wicked, future probation, restoration, community of goods, denial of the divinity of Christ, no devil, no baptism, no organization, etc., etc. Gracious! And these are the people sent with a 'message' to warn the church!"

Of course, the inference here is that Seventh-day Adventists hold and teach these doctrines. It is "Seventh-day Adventism" that Mr. Canright is professedly writing against. True, he here uses only the terms "Adventists" and "Adventism," but he leaves the reader to believe that he is speaking of the system of doctrine which he renounced. Now, there are in existence a number of religious bodies which use the word "Adventist" or "Adventists" as a part of their denominational name, and he here proceeds to throw all these Adventist bodies into one group, and then begins to enumerate doctrines supposedly held by them, leaving the reader to draw the conclusion that these are the doctrines held by Seventh-day Adventists. It is just as if we should set out to write a book against the faith of the Missionary Baptists, and then charge to that church all the beliefs, good or bad, of the many other branches of the Baptists.

Seventh-day Adventists hold little in common with other

churches who use the term "Adventist" in their denominational name. What these others may believe is their own concern, and the name they go by is no doubt of their own choosing. Whether some of them believe in the "nonresurrection of the wicked, future probation, . . . community of goods, denial of the divinity of Christ, no devil, no baptism," we do not know, but we do know, and Mr. Canright knew when he wrote these words, that *Seventh-day Adventists do not believe these things*. Not one of these doctrines was ever held by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. But Seventh-day Adventists do believe in visions when these visions are from the Lord, and they also believe in the miracles recorded in the Bible. To cast aside the miracles of Jesus Christ is to reject His divinity, and to refuse the instruction God has given through visions, is to reject a very considerable portion of the Sacred Scriptures. As to the views of Seventh-day Adventists regarding the sleep of the dead and the final annihilation of the wicked, the reader is referred to the chapter in this book dealing with these subjects.

These facts were, of course, well known to Mr. Canright, but in an effort to confuse the minds of his readers he apparently gathered together all the errors he could think of, charged them against the "Adventists" as a group, and left the reader to infer that these things were held and taught by the denomination under review, i. e., the Seventh-day Adventists. We ask our readers to ponder this for a moment, and then decide whether it is straightforward and honest.

MEN WHO HAVE LEFT THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

On pages 61-64 of his book, Mr. Canright tries to make out a case against Seventh-day Adventists because some have left their ranks. He counts up forty-seven who were once connected with the denominational work of the Seventh-day Adventists, and who, at the time of writing his book, were no longer with that denomination. The clear inference is that a

movement could not be of God and at the same time lose so many men.

Now let us notice this point: The first company of Sabbath-keeping Adventists came into existence in 1844-45. Mr. Canright left the church in 1887. This was forty-three years after the work began. At that time he managed to count up forty-seven persons who had had some connection with the work of the church, but who, he claims, had renounced the faith and severed themselves from the church. Think of it! Forty-seven leave the church work in forty-three years!! About one a year, on the average. Still, Mr. Canright tells us on page 26 of his book that at the time he left the church the Seventh-day Adventists still had 26,112 members and 400 ministers, even after the forty-seven workers had gone away.

Does the fact that a few persons, who have been more or less prominent in the church, leave that communion and make other connections, prove that church to be untrue? We think not. If so, the work and teachings of our Lord would be discounted, for there were a number of apostasies from the ranks of His followers. Of one such experience it is stated that "from that time many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him." John 6:66. It was a question as to what even the twelve apostles would decide to do, for Jesus turned and said unto them, "Will ye also go away?" Verse 67. If every disciple of Jesus had gone away from Him, that fact would in no way have affected the truthfulness of His teaching.

Truth is not dependent upon the following it may have, nor the ability of those who may once have accepted it. The fact that Judas had a devil and still remained among the disciples, did not in any way affect the truthfulness of Christ's doctrines, any more than did the departure from Him of others who also were not in harmony with His work. Of those who left the faith in Christ's day, John says: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they

would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." 1 John 2:19.

So we say of those of whom Mr. Canright speaks as having left the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The fact is that a number of them did not go out willingly, but were disfellowshipped because their lives were not in harmony with the high standards of the church. It might be of interest to the reader to know Mr. Canright's own evaluation of these persons, as he stated it in writing just a short while before he left the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Concerning one of them he wrote:

"The next thing I heard was that the church [which he joined after he left the Seventh-day Adventist Church] had expelled him for bad conduct. He was turned out of the church and silenced as a preacher."—*Review and Herald*, May 24, 1877.

Of others among his list of forty-seven he had written while he himself was still a Seventh-day Adventist:

"I know many of the persons who have left us, and I know them to be hard cases. That party [the organization to which some of them had gone] may whitewash them and defend them as long as they choose, but these are the facts."—*Ibid*.

He then proceeds to tell of the misconduct of some who for this reason were disfellowshipped, and then later, when he writes a book against Seventh-day Adventists, he holds up the fact that these persons had left the Seventh-day Adventists as evidence that the work of this church was crumbling and that their leading men were all leaving the sinking ship. Mr. Canright says that forty-seven had left us. But let it be clearly understood that these forty-seven were not the pillars of the church. Since that time many thousands of others have come into the church to fill up the ranks, and instead of 400 preachers, as at the time of Mr. Canright's leaving, there are now 10,850 evangelical laborers and as many other workers giving their full time to various other lines of the work of the church, in practically every land of earth.

“IT LEADS TO INFIDELITY”

One of the most serious charges made against Seventh-day Adventism by Mr. Canright is, “*It leads to infidelity.*”—“*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,*” p. 64.

Surely this is a most astonishing charge! Seventh-day Adventists believe in a personal God, in the deity of Jesus Christ, and in the deity and work of the Holy Spirit. They believe in a literal creation; in the vicarious atonement made by Christ on Calvary; in the second advent of our Lord; and in a literal heaven and hell, but not in eternal torment. They believe that the Bible is the very word of God, given to men by inspiration of the Spirit; that it constitutes a perfect rule of conduct for man. Seventh-day Adventists are the Fundamentalists of the Fundamentalists. And yet Mr. Canright, knowing these facts, boldly asserted to his readers that Seventh-day Adventism leads to infidelity! Such a charge is manifestly absurd.

To buttress his argument on this point, Mr. Canright mentions some who had left the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and relates how they had made shipwreck of their faith. Thus he tells us on pages 62 and 63 of his book that one brother became a Universalist, while two others became Spiritualists. Two persons joined the Age-to-Come party, one became a noted blasphemer, another a libertine, etc., etc. And this, he says, proves that Seventh-day Adventism leads to infidelity! Does it? or does it, perchance, prove that those who renounce Seventh-day Adventism turn away from the light into darkness, and thus drift away from God?

Infidels and Seventh-day Adventists have nothing in common. If a member should turn toward infidelity, it would lead speedily to his separation from the church, as the teachings of the church are diametrically opposed to infidelity. The two cannot walk together because they are not agreed. Mr. Canright's statement, therefore, is untrue and misleading.

It is just the reverse of the fact. Seventh-day Adventism is a safeguard against infidelity, and any one ardently believing the doctrines of this church is entirely safe from this grossest of all errors.

LACK OF SCHOLARSHIP

One of the charges made by Mr. Canright against the Seventh-day Adventists is on the point of their lack of scholarship. They are all an ignorant lot, therefore how can their doctrine be true? Note his words:

"Mrs. White received no school education, except a few weeks when a child. She . . . was wholly illiterate, not knowing the simplest rules of grammar. Not one of the leading men in that work ever graduated from college or university, and many are illiterate as Mrs. White herself."—*"Seventh-day Adventism Renounced,"* p. 35.

This affords a fair sample of the exaggeration so common in Mr. Canright's books. Webster defines "illiterate" as "unlettered; ignorant of letters or books, . . . unable to read." Now to say that Mrs. White was "wholly illiterate" is equivalent to saying that she was unable even to read. But Mrs. White could not only read, but she could read well, as the many thousands who heard her read the Scriptures can testify. And not only did Mrs. White read well, but she read rather widely and very intelligently, as her writings bear witness.

As to the illiteracy of the leading men among Seventh-day Adventists, the charge breaks down before the undeniable facts which Mr. Canright himself admits.

On page 63 of his book he talks about their "college professors," and speaks of their colleges in Battle Creek and California and of academies in the East. On page 64 he speaks of their physicians, naming a number of them, and of the sanitariums which they were conducting.

Think of it! An organization made up of illiterate people, who do not know the simplest rules of grammar, carrying on full-fledged colleges, its members acting as college presidents and professors, and receiving recognition in many lands! Think

of physicians who have never been to college, registering under the law of various States and being licensed to practice medicine! Surely this statement is utterly ridiculous.

Seventh-day Adventists have developed an efficient system of denominational education. They have a chain of colleges, junior colleges, academies, and primary schools that reaches around the earth. Their students now number 90,465. A Grade A medical college is operated in California, whose credits are recognized in most of the countries of the world. Graduates from these institutions of learning are to be found in every land, where they are serving as ministers, teachers, and physicians. Surely it is strange that such an efficient educational system should be established upon a foundation of such profound ignorance!*

But Seventh-day Adventists do not rely upon their scholarship. The theology of a church should never be tested by the number of college credits which its ministers can muster. The truths of God are established upon a far more solid foundation than human learning. When Mr. Canright was naming some of the so-called unlearned Seventh-day Adventist leaders, he might, had he thought to do so, have added to his list such men as Peter, James, John, Matthew, and others whom Jesus chose as His disciples and to whom He committed the affairs of His church. He might have mentioned John the Baptist. One of the charges brought against Jesus Himself was that He was unlearned. In every age there have been those who have trusted in the multitude of their mighty men. (See Hosea 10:13.) "Put not your trust in princes," said David,

*NOTE.—On our desk, as these pages are being prepared for the printer, lies a copy of the New Testament in Chasu, one of the native languages of Africa. This volume, neatly printed and strongly bound, bears on its title page the imprint of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1922. The translation was made by a Seventh-day Adventist missionary, who prepared also a grammar of the Chasu language, a work listed today by a Paris firm specializing in Oriental and other tongues. It is the only grammar of the Chasu language. Uneducated men do not make Bible translations in harmony with the rules and regulations for translators given out by the British and Foreign Bible Society; they do not reduce native languages to writing, nor standardize languages by the creation of grammars.
—BOOK EDITORS.

“nor in the son of man, in whom there is no salvation [margin]. . . . Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God.” Ps. 146:3-5.

The great apostle to the Gentiles also earnestly warned the church against the danger of trusting to worldly wisdom, when he wrote to the Corinthians:

“Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” 1 Cor. 1:25-31.

Scholarship, therefore, is no safe test of theology. The doctrines of a church are not to be tested by the learning or ignorance of its membership or ministry. A “Thus saith the Lord” is the only safe foundation for our faith, and the word of God is so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. (See Isa. 35:8.)

This must not be understood, however, as granting, even for the sake of argument, that Seventh-day Adventists are a company of ignoramuses, or that their ministers come behind those of other Protestant denominations in sound Christian scholarship, for such is not the case.

WORK AMONG THE HEATHEN

Of the work of Seventh-day Adventists, Mr. Canright says:

“They have missions in many of the large cities and in foreign lands; but they are wholly proselyting agencies. They do not work among the heathen, nor for the destitute and fallen.”—*Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 31.

And again we read:

"Their 'missions,' of which they boast so much, are not to convert the heathen of the foreign lands, nor the drunkards, wretched and degraded, of our cities, but to proselyte or work among people already in fair circumstances."—*Id.*, p. 83.

As stated in Chapter I of this volume, Seventh-day Adventists believe that they have a message to bear to all the peoples of earth, Christian and pagan, Jew and Gentile, civilized and uncivilized. Said the prophet Joel, "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:1. They preach the message to all who will hear.

But to suggest that this preaching is addressed only to church members, either at home or abroad, is a gross misrepresentation. The writer spent a number of years as a missionary leader in Africa, and therefore can speak from first-hand knowledge. He knows personally that in the Dark Continent the vast majority of the many thousands of converts to the Seventh-day Adventist faith have been won from the most primitive tribes; often our missionaries have gone where others had never been before them; they have established hospitals, schools, and chapels, and have civilized and Christianized natives who hitherto had had no knowledge whatsoever of God.

Seventh-day Adventist mission stations are to be found far away from the centers of civilization, out where the darkness of heathenism has reigned supreme for generations. The writer has personally had the privilege of preaching in many a heathen village the first gospel sermon the villagers had ever heard. And what is true of the work of Seventh-day Adventists in Africa is true of their work in the cannibal islands of the South Seas, in India, in Borneo, in China, and in fact in every heathen land. Seventh-day Adventists probably have more missions operating today amid heathen surroundings than any other single Protestant church in the world.

What, then, becomes of the statement that they do not work for the heathen? It is untrue, just as are most of Mr.

Canright's other statements regarding the faith and work of Seventh-day Adventists.

"A SYSTEM OF POPERY"

Again Mr. Canright says:

"Seventh-day Adventism is a system of popery—one-man power."—*Id.*, p. 81.

This is one of the most amazing charges made by Mr. Canright against the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Of course any one who has the slightest knowledge of the character of the Seventh-day Adventist organization knows that this statement is as far from the truth as the south pole is from the north. A system of popery is exactly what Seventh-day Adventism is not. It is the antithesis of popery. In a system of popery the people take their orders from the head. The pope's word is law. In Seventh-day Adventism the head takes orders from the people and from committees of control. Their word is law. The head cannot alter their decisions.

For instance, in each State or provincial conference, the people choose a president, who holds office for two years. But he is not made a lord over God's heritage. He is the chairman of a committee of control. This committee is chosen by the people. The people make their own plans for the conduct of the work within their territory, while together in conference session. They delegate to the president and this executive committee the authority to carry out these plans and make them effective.

The conference president is the ranking officer of the conference committee. The committee usually consists of from seven to fifteen men, all chosen by the people. They have no authority to change anything that was done in conference assembled. If they feel that a change should be made in any important plan or policy, they must wait until the next conference session or call a special session. At the session they can

lay their proposals before the people, but the people can accept or reject them at will. No one has any power of coercion. Every two years the term of office of the president and members of the executive committee expire. They may be re-elected or they may not. It depends entirely upon how they have performed their work—whether they have given satisfaction. They have no life lease on these positions. They cannot continue themselves in office.

The General Conference organization embraces all local, union, and division conferences. It has a president, two general vice-presidents, an additional vice-president for each great continental division, a secretary, two associate secretaries, a treasurer, a subtreasurer, two assistant treasurers, and a secretary-treasurer for each continental division. If these officials constituted the entire board of control of the general affairs of the denomination, it would even then be far from a system of popery, for this group alone would constitute a board of some forty men.

But as a matter of fact, these men are only servants of a large committee of control known as the General Conference Committee. This committee consists of some two hundred members, and holds council meetings in the spring and autumn of each year, to consider policies and plans for the prosecution of the denominational work throughout the world. Other meetings of easily available members of this committee are held frequently throughout the year, but these minority meetings have no authority to alter any general policy adopted by the full committee at its regular councils, when representatives from the world field are present.

In a system of popery the head of the church has power to set aside decisions of councils with which he is not in agreement. Note the following statement from a Catholic authority:

"He [the Pope] is not subject to them [the canons of the church], because he is competent to modify or to annul them when he holds this to be best for the church."—*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XII, art. "Pope," p. 268.

But the president of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference, who is the highest official in the church, cannot set aside any council action. The decisions of the councils govern. He cannot change a jot or tittle of them. He may recommend changes in policy at the next meeting, but he has no means of enforcing such recommendations, except by debate and personal influence, based upon the confidence the council may have in his leadership. He cannot spend \$100 of the denomination's funds for any purpose whatsoever, be it ever so worthy, without authorization of the General Conference Committee. Neither can the General Conference treasurer do so. The president does not take a trip into any part of the field without committee action. He writes no official letters to his under-officers in an effort to enforce his individual opinion; his correspondence must represent the will of the committee. He issues no fiat and hands down no personal decisions. He is a servant of the General Conference Committee, and he and the committee serve the people.

The General Conference president, his assistant officers, and many members of the committee hold office for four years. They are elected at a quadrennial session of the General Conference, which is usually attended by about six hundred official delegates representing the church in every land, and by some six to ten thousand nonofficial visitors. This great and thoroughly representative gathering chooses whomsoever they will for the leadership of the church for the ensuing term. The former officials have no further claim upon the offices they have held. Their term has expired. They lay down the burden. If perchance the conference should so desire, these same individuals may be re-elected to office for another four years, but the farthest limit of their tenure of office in any one position is twelve years.

But this decision rests entirely with the delegates. They are the people's representatives. This large body of representatives is acknowledged by all Seventh-day Adventist churches and or-

ganizations as the highest administrative authority among them.

A one-man power? No! It is exactly the opposite. In Seventh-day Adventism the church officers serve the people instead of the people serving their officials.

From the foregoing review it must already be evident to the candid reader that Mr. Canright certainly handles the truth lightly, and that his book is filled with misstatements and misrepresentations. Much more could be said along this line, but enough has been presented to reveal fully the unreliability of Mr. Canright's books. And if his statements are thus unreliable, then surely he is not a safe guide to those who are earnestly inquiring for truth.

CHAPTER XVIII

LET IN THE LIGHT

THE great issues involved in this discussion are altogether too vital to be lightly considered. The truth of God is more precious than gold, and we are bidden to search for it as for rubies. We believe we have clearly shown that in renouncing Seventh-day Adventism, Mr. Canright also renounced many of the great fundamental principles of the gospel, and in reality placed himself on the side of the opposers of the truth. Every argument that he has advanced against the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventists breaks down upon examination, and those who are misled by them are surely building their spiritual houses upon the sand.

The word of God is the only safe and secure foundation upon which one can build his hope of eternal life. Be a doctrine ever so popular, if it is not established upon that word, it is unworthy of acceptance. Nor does the unpopularity of a doctrine prove it to be false. Truth has never been popular. She has always had to plead her cause, and has suffered much ridicule at the hands of so-called wise men.

In the sixteenth century, as light broke over the world that led away from and out of the night of papal supremacy, the Reformers were sorely persecuted and everywhere denounced by the recognized religious leaders of their day. Their enemies pounced upon them like dogs of war. Yet the messages of these Reformers were Heaven sent, and finally came to be recognized as light from above.

But those early Reformers did not receive a full and complete revelation of all the truths which had been lost sight of during the Dark Ages, when the church was in apostasy. A fine statement of this fact is found in the notable farewell address

of Rev. John Robinson, pastor of the English Puritans, to the many members of his congregation who turned from Holland to seek homes in the New World. Upon this memorable occasion he said:

“Brethren, we are now erelong to part asunder, and the Lord knoweth whether I shall live ever to see your faces more. But whether the Lord hath appointed it or not, I charge you before God and His blessed angels to follow me no farther than I have followed Christ. If God should reveal anything to you by any other instrument of His, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth of my ministry; for I am very confident the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of His holy word. . . .

“Remember your church covenant, in which you have agreed to walk in all the ways of the Lord, made or to be made known unto you. Remember your promise and covenant with God and with one another, to receive whatever light and truth shall be made known to you from His written word; but withal, take heed, I beseech you, what you receive for truth, and compare it and weigh it with other scriptures of truth before you accept it; for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.”—*“History of the English Puritans,”* by W. C. Martyn, Vol. V, pp. 70, 71.

“For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; . . . and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented; for though they were burning and shining lights in their time, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were they now living, would be as willing to embrace further light as that which they first received.”—*“History of the Puritans,”* by D. Neal, Vol. I, p. 269 (two-vol. ed., 1848).

In these remarks Mr. Robinson was right. The uncovering and unfolding of the truths of the gospel in the last days is a matter of prophecy, and it is progressive. “The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” Prov. 4:18. The fact that a doctrine appears new is no argument against it. The fact that Seventh-day Adventism dates back only a generation is no evidence that it

does not constitute a message from God to the world. Quite to the contrary: God has warned us of the rise and spread of just such a message, and the only proper ground for questioning would be found in its failure to come.

Thus we read in Malachi 3:1, 2:

“Behold, I will send My messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of His coming? and who shall stand when He appeareth? for He is like a refiner’s fire, and like fullers’ soap.”

Also the prophet Joel tells of this preparatory message in the following graphic language:

“Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand.” Joel 2:1.

To John on lonely Patmos the rise and work of this message was also revealed, and he said:

“I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.” Rev. 14:6-10.

Here is a special message from God which sweeps through the whole earth. It takes in all peoples and tongues. It announces that “the hour of His [God’s] judgment is come.” It warns against the beast (the papal power which changed God’s law and Sabbath), and against the reception of his mark.

In verse 12 we learn that the result of this message will be the gathering out of a people from the nations of the earth who will obey all God's commandments. Of them it is said: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

Immediately following this John says:

"I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on His head a golden crown, and in His hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to Him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in Thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for Thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And He that sat on the cloud thrust in His sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." Rev. 14:14-16.

Thus we see that the message which prepares the way for the coming of the divine Harvester (Jesus) is the judgment-hour message which leads men to the keeping of the *commandments of God* and the *faith of Jesus*. There is no conflict between these two. The faith (the teachings or doctrines) of Jesus, is not contrary to the commandments of God, and those who truly follow Jesus and who make proper preparation for His coming will honor and obey His law. There was nothing in the life, death, or resurrection of Christ that in any way lessened the authority of the moral code.

No more God-dishonoring doctrine could be preached than that the atonement of Christ has freed men from the obligation to obey God's moral law. To make it possible for man to obey was its highest and holiest object. Is it reasonable that Christ should die to save men from the guilt of transgression, give them a free pardon for the past, and then say to them, "Now you are free; go steal, lie, commit adultery, kill, desecrate the Sabbath of God, etc."? No! a thousand times no! Saved men are not free to break the law of God. True, they are set free from its condemnation for sins of the past which they themselves were powerless to undo, but license has not been given them to presume upon God's goodness by continuing in transgression.

A man can be forgiven and justified before God who has never kept the law, but he cannot remain in this justified state without keeping it. He does not keep the law in order to become a Christian, but, being a Christian, he must keep it in a manner that becomes one.

“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.”
I Cor. 6:9-11.

“Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven.” Matt. 7:21.

“Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.” James 1:22.

Thus God calls men back to the keeping of His holy law. This includes the seventh-day Sabbath and all. Of the heralds of this message it is said:

“They that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in.

“If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” Isa. 58:12-14.

This, then, is a message of Sabbath reform. It constitutes a turning back to the old paths of God’s word, the paths spoken of by David when he said: “Make me to go in the path of Thy commandments; for therein do I delight.” Ps. 119:35.

This we believe is the Elijah message promised in Malachi’s prophecy where he said: “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.” Mal. 4:5.

Now the outstanding event in Elijah's experience was the mighty reformation he brought about in Israel on the point of regard for the law of God. After the three and one-half years of drouth, during which time Elijah was in hiding, he was bidden of God to go and appear before Ahab the king. "And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" He was thus charged with responsibility for the awful drouth that had caused so much suffering in Israel. But Elijah answered, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." 1 Kings 18:17-19. When the people were gathered together, fire was sent down from heaven to prove that Elijah's message was true and that he was God's servant, and the outcome of it all was a mighty reformation in Israel.

Now just such a message is to be given again before the second advent of Christ. God's promise is, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."

Just as in the days of Elijah, many of the professed people of God have forsaken His commandments, and are following the doctrines of a false god. In the keeping of Sunday they are obeying the mandates of the papal church, whose head has exalted himself to the position of "another god on earth." He is spoken of as "Lord God the Pope." The church of which he is head has given us a new sabbath and a changed law. "It has cast the truth to the ground." Dan. 8:12. But just as the world is about to meet its God over His broken law; just as men are about to be summoned before the great judgment seat of Christ to be weighed in the balances of the Lord, the Elijah message is sent forth, calling the nations back again into full harmony with the law of their God. Once again the words of Elijah are pertinent:

"Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow Him: but if

Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word."
1 Kings 18:21.

Said the great evangelist, Moody:

"The law that was given at Sinai has lost none of its solemnity. Time cannot wear out its authority or the fact of its authorship. . . .

"Now men may cavil as much as they like about other parts of the Bible, but I have never met an honest man that found fault with the ten commandments. Infidels may mock the Lawgiver, and reject Him who has delivered us from the curse of the law, but they can't help admitting that the commandments are right. Renan said that they are for all nations, and will remain the commandments of God during all the centuries.

"If God created this world, He must make some laws to govern it. In order to make life safe we must have good laws; there is not a country the sun shines upon that does not possess laws. Now this is God's law. It has come from on high, and infidels and skeptics have to admit that it is pure. . . .

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is pure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes."

"Now the question for you and me is, Are we keeping these commandments? Have we fulfilled all the requirements of the law? If God made us, as we know He did, He had a right to make that law; and if we don't use it aright, it would have been better for us if we had never had it, for it will condemn us. We shall be found wanting. The law is all right, but are we right?"—*"Weighed and Wanting," D. L. Moody, pp. 11, 12.*

"Some people seem to think we have got beyond the commandments. What did Christ say? 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.' The commandments of God given to Moses in the mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people. The Jews said the law was not given in Palestine (which belonged to Israel), but in the wilderness, because the law was for all nations.

"Jesus never condemned the law and the prophets, but He did condemn those who did not obey them. Because He gave new commandments, it does not follow that He abolished the old. Christ's explanation of them made them all the more searching."
—*Id., pp. 14, 15.*

"The conviction deepens in me with the years, that the old truths of the Bible must be stated and restated in the plainest possible language."—*Id.*, p. 15.

"The people must be made to understand that the ten commandments are still binding, and that there is a penalty attached to their violation. We do not want a gospel of mere sentiment. The sermon on the mount did not blot out the ten commandments.

"When Christ came, He condensed the statement of the law into this form: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.' Paul said: 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.' But does this mean that the detailed precepts of the decalogue are superseded, and have become back numbers? Does a father cease to give children rules to obey because they love him? Does a nation burn its statute books because the people have become patriotic? Not at all. And yet people speak as if the commandments do not hold for Christians because they have come to love God. Paul said: 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid. Yea, we establish the law.' It still holds good. The commandments are necessary. So long as we obey, they do not rest heavy upon us; but as soon as we try to break away, we find they are like fences to keep us within bounds. Horses need bridles even after they have been properly broken in. . . .

"Now face these ten commandments honestly and prayerfully. See if your life is right, and if you are treating God fairly. God's statutes are just, are they not? If they are right, let us see if we are right. Let us pray that the Holy Ghost may search each one of us. Let us get alone with God and read His law—read it carefully and prayerfully, and ask Him to show us our sins and what He would have us to do."—*Id.*, pp. 16, 17.

If in perusing this volume the reader has been convinced that he has been living in violation of some command of God, we earnestly beseech him to turn this day from such transgression, and yield obedience to God's requirements. We are soon to be weighed in the balances. Shall we risk heaven by continuing in disobedience? We cannot shut our eyes to light and truth, and still be found just before God. The Lord declares, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9.

How pitiful is the case of one who, through the rejection of light, has come to the place where his prayers are unanswered and his petitions remain ungranted.

But let none undertake to keep God's holy law in human weakness. It is only by the grace of God and the indwelling of Christ Jesus in the heart that man can do anything good. Our weakness must take hold upon His unfailing strength if we would succeed in our efforts to attain to the righteousness of the law. He is able to work in you "both to will and to do of His good pleasure." He can strengthen you "with might by His Spirit in the inner man." Eph. 3:16. If Christ, who knocks at the heart's door, is permitted to come in, He will ascend the heart's throne, and will exercise His kingly power in subduing the life and causing it to conform to His will as revealed in His holy law. He is *able* to save to the uttermost. He can do "exceeding abundantly" above all we ask or think, and with Paul we can say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Phil. 4:13.

Thus we see the Christ of the atonement, by whose blood we are cleansed from past sins, coming to dwell and work in us even to the point of making us "perfect in every good work." This, then, is the crowning work of the world's Redeemer. Not only does He pardon repenting sinners, but He fully restores His image in them by bringing them back into harmony with God's holy law through the power of His own indwelling presence.

Dear reader, have you often mourned that you found it hard to be good and obey God's requirements? Of course you have. You might well go farther, and say that it is humanly impossible, for so it is. "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:12. But the indwelling Christ makes all the difference between success and failure. He has all power in heaven and in earth, and He offers to bring that power to bear upon the weak tendencies of your nature, and make you mighty through God to do His will; and with God, nothing is impossible.

This is what David meant when he said, "I will run the way of Thy commandments, when Thou shalt enlarge my heart." Ps. 119:32. "I cried unto Thee: Save me, and I shall keep

[margin, "that I may keep"] Thy testimonies." Ps. 119:146. Those, therefore, who have the sweet, abiding presence of Jesus in their hearts will be led to declare with David, "O how love I Thy law! it is my meditation all the day." Ps. 119:97. And if Jesus is allowed full and complete control, they will have the great joy of seeing the power of sin subdued in their lives and every thought brought into captivity to the will of Christ.

Will you, then, dear reader, open wide the heart's door and let Prince Emmanuel in? Will you tell Him that you are willing that He should live His life of perfect obedience to the moral law of God in your flesh? Will you do this, not only today, but every day? If so, then you will daily know the joy of wearing the robe of His righteousness, and in the day of God you will stand before Him unashamed.

Kansas City
Public Library



Presented to the Library by

R. R. Miller

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



130 437

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY